



**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

ALL ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA ARE SCHEDULED FOR ACTION UNLESS SPECIFICALLY NOTED OTHERWISE.

THESE PROCEEDINGS ARE BEING PRESENTED LIVE ON KCLV, CABLE CHANNEL 2. THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING, AS WELL AS ALL OTHER KCLV PROGRAMMING, CAN BE VIEWED ON THE CITY'S INTERNET AT [www.kclv.tv](http://www.kclv.tv). THE PROCEEDINGS WILL BE REBROADCAST ON KCLV CHANNEL 2 AND THE WEB SATURDAY AT 10:00 AM, THE FOLLOWING MONDAY AT MIDNIGHT AND TUESDAY AT 5:00 PM.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE was led by CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE.

CALL TO ORDER 6:04 P.M. in Council Chambers of City Hall, 400 Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada

ANNOUNCEMENT RE: COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN MEETING LAW

**MINUTES:**

**PRESENT:** CHAIRMAN GLENN TROWBRIDGE, MEMBERS STEVEN EVANS, RICHARD TRUESDELL, BYRON GOYNES, DAVID STEINMAN AND SAM DUNNAM

**EXCUSED:** LEO DAVENPORT

**STAFF PRESENT:** MARGO WHEELER – PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPT., DOUG RANKIN – PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPT., SETH FLOYD – PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPT., BART ANDERSON – PUBLIC WORKS, VICTOR BALANOS – PUBLIC WORKS, JAMES LEWIS – CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, ANGELA CROLLI – CITY CLERK'S OFFICE, CARMEL VIADO – CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

**SUBJECT:**

Approval of the minutes of the May 11, 2006 Planning Commission Meeting

**MOTION:**

**EVANS - APPROVED – UNANIMOUS**

**MINUTES:**

There was no discussion.

(6:05)

**1- 39**

**MOTION:**

**EVANS – Motion to HOLD IN ABEYANCE Item 28 [VAR-12782] to 6/22/2006; Item 13 [MOD-12919], Item 14 [VAR-12925], Item 15 [SDR-12922] to 7/13/2006; and TABLE Item 29 [TXT-13518] – UNANIMOUS**

**MINUTES:**

DOUG RANKIN, Planning and Development Department, stated that the applicants for the following items requested the items be held in abeyance or tabled. Letters are on file for each of the requests.

Item 13 [MOD-12919]	Abeyance to 7/13/2006 Planning Commission Meeting
Item 14 [VAR-12925]	Abeyance to 7/13/2006 Planning Commission Meeting
Item 15 [SDR-12922]	Abeyance to 7/13/2006 Planning Commission Meeting
Item 28 [VAR-12782]	Abeyance to 6/22/2006 Planning Commission Meeting
Item 29 [TXT-13518]	TABLED

The applicant of Item 13 [MOD-12919], Item 14 [VAR-12925] and Item 15 [SDR-12922] requested an abeyance to 7/13/2006 because a necessary application is needed for the Special Use Permit and the applicant is revising the plans.

The applicant of Item 28 [VAR-12782] has requested an abeyance to 6/22/2006 in order to review and address staff's concerns.

Staff requested Item 29 [TXT-13518] be tabled until further action by the City Council.

(6:06 – 6:07)

**1-60**



**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

**CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE** announced the subdivision items could be appealed by the applicant or aggrieved person or a review requested by a member of the City Council.

**ACTIONS:**

ALL ACTIONS ON TENTATIVE AND FINAL SUBDIVISION MAPS ARE FINAL UNLESS AN APPEAL IS FILED BY THE APPLICANT OR AN AGGRIEVED PERSON, OR A REVIEW IS REQUESTED BY A MEMBER OF THE CITY COUNCIL WITHIN SEVEN DAYS OF THE DATE NOTICE IS SENT TO THE APPLICANT. UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED DURING THE MEETING, ALL OTHER ACTIONS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ARE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CITY COUNCIL, IN WHICH CASE ALL FINAL DECISIONS, CONDITIONS, STIPULATIONS OR LIMITATIONS ARE MADE BY THE CITY COUNCIL.

**CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE** read the statement on the order of the items and the time limitations on persons wishing to be heard on an item.

ANY ITEM LISTED IN THIS AGENDA MAY BE TAKEN OUT OF ORDER IF SO REQUESTED BY THE APPLICANT, STAFF, OR A MEMBER OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION. THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAY IMPOSE TIME LIMITATIONS, AS NECESSARY, ON THOSE PERSONS WISHING TO BE HEARD ON ANY AGENDA ITEM.



**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

**CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE noted the Rules of Conduct.**

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING RULES OF CONDUCT.**

1. Staff will present each item to the Commission in order as shown on the agenda, along with a recommendation and suggested conditions of approval, if appropriate.
2. The applicant is asked to be at the public microphone during the staff presentation. When the staff presentation is complete, the applicant should state his name and address, and indicate whether or not he accepts staff's conditions of approval.
3. If areas of concern are known in advance, or if the applicant does not accept staff's conditions, the applicant or his representative is invited to make a brief presentation of his item with emphasis on any items of concern.
4. Persons other than the applicant who support the request are invited to make brief statements after the applicant. If more than one supporter is present, comments should not be repetitive. A representative is welcome to speak and indicate that he speaks for others in the audience who share his view.
5. Objectors to the item will be heard after the applicant and any other supporters. All who wish to speak will be heard, but in the interest of time it is suggested that representatives be selected who can summarize the views of any groups of interested parties.
6. After all objectors' input has been received, the applicant will be invited to respond to any new issues raised.
7. Following the applicant's response, the public hearing will be closed; Commissioners will discuss the item amongst themselves, ask any questions they feel are appropriate, and proceed to a motion and decision on the matter.
8. Letters, petitions, photographs and other submissions to the Commission will be retained for the record. Large maps, models and other materials may be displayed to the Commission from the microphone area, but need not be handed in for the record unless requested by the Commission.

As a courtesy, we would also ask those not speaking to be seated and not interrupt the speaker or the Commission. We appreciate your courtesy and hope you will help us make your visit with the Commission a good and fair experience.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☒ **CONSENT** ☐ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**TMP-13107 - TENTATIVE MAP - ASTORIA HOMES AT CLIFF'S EDGE POD 301 -**  
**APPLICANT/OWNER: THE ASTORIA CORPORATION** - Request for a Tentative Map FOR A 192 LOT SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION on 20.50 acres at the southeast corner of Puli Road and Dorrell Lane (APN 126-24-210-001) PD (Planned Development) Zone, Ward 6 (Ross).

**P.C. FINAL ACTION**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

**0**

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

**0**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Clark County School District Letter

**MOTION:**

**EVANS – APPROVED** subject to conditions Item 1 [TMP-13107] and Item 2 [TMP-13247]  
**– UNANIMOUS** with **DAVENPORT** excused

**This is Final Action**

**MINUTES:**

There was no discussion.

(6:07 – 6:08)

**1-103**

**CONDITIONS:**

Planning and Development

1. Approval of the Tentative Map shall be for no more than two (2) years. If a Final Map is not recorded on all or a portion of the area embraced by the Tentative Map within two (2) years of the approval of the Tentative Map, this action is void.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 1 – TMP-13107

**CONDITIONS – Continued:**

2. Street names must be provided in accordance with the City's Street Naming Regulations.
3. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures.
4. In conjunction with creation, declaration and recordation of the subject common-interest community, and prior to recordation of the Covenants, Codes and Restrictions ("CC&R"), or conveyance of any unit within the community, the Developer is required to record a Declaration of Private Maintenance Requirements ("DPMR") as a covenant on all associated properties, and on behalf of all current and future property owners. The DPMR is to include a listing of all privately owned and/or maintained infrastructure improvements, along with assignment of maintenance responsibility for each to the common interest community or the respective individual property owners, and is to provide a brief description of the required level of maintenance for privately maintained components. The DPMR must be reviewed and approved by the City of Las Vegas Department of Field Operations prior to recordation, and must include a statement that all properties within the community are subject to assessment for all associated costs should private maintenance obligations not be met, and the City of Las Vegas be required to provide for said maintenance. Also, the CC&R are to include a statement of obligation of compliance with the DPMR. Following recordation, the Developer is to submit copies of the recorded DPMR and CC&R documents to the City of Las Vegas Department of Field Operations.
5. The subject plan reflects the installation of water mains within easements, which does not meet District standards. All District water mains must be installed in dedicated private drives or rights-of-way. If easements are pursued they must comply with District Service Rules Section 10.1j and Uniform Design and Construction Standards for Water Distribution Systems Section 2.04.
6. All development is subject to the conditions of City Departments and State Subdivision Statutes, and with any conditions set by the Master Developer per the Cliff's Edge development agreement.

Public Works

7. The Special Improvement District section of the Department of Public Works must be contacted and appropriate written agreements (if necessary) must be executed by the property owner(s) of record prior to the recordation of a Final Map or the issuance of any building permits, whichever may occur first. The written agreements (if applicable) will allow the recalculation and/or the redistribution of all assessments of record on this site.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 1 – TMP-13107

**CONDITIONS – Continued:**

8. If not constructed by the Master Developer, construct the full width street improvements on Puli Road and half street improvements on Shaumber Road and Dorrell Lane, including appropriate overpaving, adjacent to this site concurrent with development. In addition, a minimum of two lanes of paved, legal access to the nearest constructed public street shall be in place prior to final inspection of any units within this site. Extend all required underground utilities, such as electrical, telephone, etc., located within public rights-of-way, past the boundaries of this site prior to construction of hard surfacing (asphalt or concrete).
9. If not constructed at the time of development by the Master Developer, landscape and maintain all unimproved right-of-way, if any, on Puli Road, Shaumber Road and Dorrell Lane adjacent to this site concurrent with development of this site.
10. If not obtained at the time of development by the Master Developer, obtain an Encroachment Agreement for all landscaping and private improvements, if any, in the Puli Road, Shaumber Road and Dorrell Lane public rights-of-way adjacent to this site.
11. Show all Sight Visibility Restriction Zones (SVRZ's) on the Final Map and include the following note: "No walls, fences, trees, shrubs, utility appurtenances or any other object, other than traffic control devices and street light poles, may be constructed or installed within the Sight Visibility Restriction Zone (S.V.R.Z.) unless said object is maintained at less than 24 inches in height measured from adjacent top of curb, or where no curb exists, a height of 27 inches measured from the top of adjacent asphalt, gravel, or pavement street surface. Area shall be labeled as "Privately Maintained".
12. Grant appropriate public sewer easements across Lot 7, Common Element C, Common Element E and across the Parent Common Element. Provide public sewer easements for all public sewers not located within existing public street right-of-way prior to the issuance of any permits. Improvement Drawings submitted to the City for review shall not be approved for construction until all required public sewer easements necessary to connect this site to the existing public sewer system have been granted to the City.
13. Gated entry drives shall be designed, located and constructed in accordance with Standard Drawing #222a.
14. A Homeowners' Association shall be established to maintain all private roadways, landscaping and common areas created with this development. All landscaping and private improvements shall be situated and maintained so as to not create sight visibility

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 1 – TMP-13107

**CONDITIONS – Continued:**

- obstructions for vehicular traffic at all development access drives and abutting street intersections.
15. Meet with the Fire Protection Engineering Section of the Department of Fire Services prior to submittal of a Final Map for this site. The design and layout of all onsite private circulation and access drives shall meet the approval of the Department of Fire Services.
  16. Label the 25-foot streets as “private drives” on the Final Map. Private streets and private drives must be common lots granted as public utility easements (P.U.E.), City of Las Vegas sewer easements and public drainage easements to be privately maintained by the Homeowner’s Association.
  17. All entrances to this subdivision from the adjacent public streets crossing common lots created by the Cliffs Edge Parent Map Book 118 Page 88 shall be labeled as “Public Utility Easement (P.U.E.), City of Las Vegas Sewer Easements and Public Drainage Easements to be Privately Maintained by the Homeowners’ Association”. These easements need to be granted to the City of Las Vegas. The title page of this map shall include a Master Homeowners’ Association Owner Certificate and signature to grant these easements. Show and dimension the common lots and adjacent right-of-way on the Final Map(s) for this site as recorded by the Cliff’s Edge parent map and include the recorder’s information (subdivision name, book and page number).
  18. Public drainage easements must be common lots or within private streets or private drives that are to be privately maintained by a homeowners’ association or maintenance association for all public drainage not located within existing public street right-of-way.
  19. The submitted Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study must be approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, submittal of any construction drawings or the submittal of a Map subdividing this site, whichever may occur first. Provide and improve all drainageways recommended in the approved drainage plan/study. The developer of this site shall be responsible to construct such neighborhood or local drainage facility improvements as are recommended by the City of Las Vegas Neighborhood Drainage Studies and approved Drainage Plan/Study concurrent with development of this site. In lieu of constructing improvements, in whole or in part, the developer may agree to contribute monies for the construction of neighborhood or local drainage improvements, the amount of such monies shall be determined by the approved Drainage Plan/Study and shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, or the recordation of a Map subdividing this site, whichever may occur first, if allowed by the City Engineer.



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 1 – TMP-13107

**CONDITIONS – Continued:**

20. Site development to comply with all applicable conditions of approval for previous zoning actions, Cliff's Edge Parent Map, Cliff's Edge Development Standards, Design Guidelines and Development Agreement, the "Sight Distance along Shaumber Road within Cliff's Edge" design document dated March 4, 2004 and all other applicable site-related actions.
21. The approval of all Public Works related improvements shown on this Tentative Map is in concept only. Specific design and construction details relating to size, type and/or alignment of improvements, including but not limited to street, sewer and drainage improvements, shall be resolved prior to approval of the construction plans by the City. No deviations from adopted City Standards shall be allowed unless specific written approval for such is received from the City Engineer prior to the recordation of a Final Map or the approval of subdivision-related construction plans, whichever may occur first. Approval of this Tentative Map does not constitute approval of any deviations. If such approval cannot be obtained, a revised Tentative Map must be submitted showing elimination of such deviations.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☒ **CONSENT** ☐ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**TMP-13247 - BUNKER COMMONS II - APPLICANT: ROYAL CONSTRUCTION CO. - OWNER: SF INVESTMENT, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY** - Request for a Tentative Map FOR A 16 LOT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION on 3.63 acres adjacent to the southwest corner of Peak Drive and Jones Boulevard (APN: 138-14-702-003 and 009), U (Undeveloped) Zone under Resolution of Intent to R-1 (Single Family Residential), Ward 5 (Weekly).

**P.C. FINAL ACTION**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

**0**

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

**0**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

**MOTION:**

**EVANS – APPROVED** subject to conditions Item 1 [TMP-13107] and Item 2 [TMP-13247]  
**– UNANIMOUS** with **DAVENPORT** excused

**This is Final Action**

**MINUTES:**

There was no discussion.

(6:07 – 6:08)

**1-103**

**CONDITIONS:**

Planning and Development

1. Approval of the Tentative Map shall be for no more than two (2) years. If a Final Map is not recorded on all or a portion of the area embraced by the Tentative Map within two (2) years of the approval of the Tentative Map, this action is void.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 2 – TMP-13247

**CONDITIONS – Continued:**

2. All development shall conform to the Conditions of Approval for Site Development Plan Review (SDR-3521) and the Rezoning (ZON-3520).
3. Street names must be provided in accordance with the City's Street Naming Regulations.
4. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures.
5. In conjunction with creation, declaration and recordation of the subject common-interest community, and prior to recordation of the Covenants, Codes and Restrictions ("CC&R"), or conveyance of any unit within the community, the Developer is required to record a Declaration of Private Maintenance Requirements ("DPMR") as a covenant on all associated properties, and on behalf of all current and future property owners. The DPMR is to include a listing of all privately owned and/or maintained infrastructure improvements, along with assignment of maintenance responsibility for each to the common interest community or the respective individual property owners, and is to provide a brief description of the required level of maintenance for privately maintained components. The DPMR must be reviewed and approved by the City of Las Vegas Department of Field Operations prior to recordation, and must include a statement that all properties within the community are subject to assessment for all associated costs should private maintenance obligations not be met, and the City of Las Vegas be required to provide for said maintenance. Also, the CC&R are to include a statement of obligation of compliance with the DPMR. Following recordation, the Developer is to submit copies of the recorded DPMR and CC&R documents to the City of Las Vegas Department of Field Operations.
6. All development is subject to the conditions of City Departments and State Subdivision Statutes.

Public Works

7. Grant a Traffic Chord Easement at the southwest corner of Peak Drive and Jones Boulevard.
8. Obtain an Encroachment Agreement for all landscaping within the public rights-of-way adjacent to this site.
9. Landscape and maintain all unimproved right-of-way adjacent to this site concurrent with development of this site.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 2 – TMP-13247

**CONDITIONS – Continued:**

10. Show all Sight Visibility Restriction Zones (SVRZ's) adjacent to public streets and include the following note: "No walls, fences, trees, shrubs, utility appurtenances or any other object, other than traffic control devices and street light poles, may be constructed or installed within the Sight Visibility Restriction Zone (S.V.R.Z.) unless said object is maintained at less than 24 inches in height measured from adjacent top of curb, or where no curb exists, a height of 27 inches measured from the top of adjacent asphalt, gravel, or pavement street surface. Area shall be labeled as "Privately Maintained".
11. Site development to comply with all applicable conditions of approval for ZON-3520 and all other subsequent site-related actions.
12. The approval of all Public Works related improvements shown on this Tentative Map is in concept only. Specific design and construction details relating to size, type and/or alignment of improvements, including but not limited to street, sewer and drainage improvements, shall be resolved prior to approval of the construction plans by the City. No deviations from adopted City Standards shall be allowed unless specific written approval for such is received from the City Engineer prior to the recordation of a Final Map or the approval of subdivision-related construction plans, whichever may occur first. Approval of this Tentative Map does not constitute approval of any deviations. If such approval cannot be obtained, a revised Tentative Map must be submitted showing elimination of such deviations.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**SUP-13271 - SPECIAL USE PERMIT - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: C.R.E.M. CORPORATION INC. - OWNER: TOFFY ENTERPRISES LLC.** - Request for a Special Use Permit FOR A RETAIL ESTABLISHMENT WITH ACCESSORY PACKAGE LIQUOR OFF-SALE on 1.22 acres at 8251 West Charleston Boulevard (APN 163-04-117-003), C-1 (Limited Commercial) Ward 1 (Tarkanian)

**C.C.: 7/12/06 – IF DENIED: P.C.: FINAL ACTION (Unless appealed within 10 days)**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>3</b>

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Protest letter by David Marsh and telephone protests by Dorothy Mapes and Carolyn Rutlieff
5. Submitted after final agenda – Condition confirmation letter by Cristobal Santos

**MOTION:**

**EVANS – APPROVED subject to conditions – UNANIMOUS with DAVENPORT excused**

**To be heard by the City Council on 7/12/2006**

**MINUTES:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE explained that these items will be considered in One Motion/One Vote and are routine public and non-public hearing items that have no protests, waivers from the Code, or condition changes by the applicant or staff. All public hearings will be opened at one time. Any person representing the applicant or a member of the Planning Commission, not in agreement with all standard conditions for the applications recommended by staff, may request to have an item removed from this part of the Agenda.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 3 – SUP-13271

**MINUTES – Continued:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing open for Item 3 [SUP-13271], Item 4 [SUP-13410], Item 5 [VAC-13136] and Item 6 [VAC-13158].

There was no discussion.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing closed for Item 3 [SUP-13271], Item 4 [SUP-13410], Item 5 [VAC-13136] and Item 6 [VAC-13158].

(6:08 – 6:11)

**1-103**

**CONDITIONS:**

Planning and Development

1. Any existing banner signs located on the establishment shall be removed. Any future temporary signs, such as banners, shall comply with the requirements of Title 19.14.090 (A).
2. The sale of alcoholic beverages shall be limited to a maximum of 10 % of the floor area of the convenience store.
3. Conformance to all Minimum Requirements under LVMC Title 19.04.050 for a retail establishment with accessory package liquor off-sale use.
4. This approval shall be void one year from the date of final approval, unless a business license has been issued to conduct the activity, if required, or upon approval of a final inspection. An Extension of Time may be filed for consideration by the City of Las Vegas.
5. Approval of this Special Use Permit does not constitute approval of a liquor license.
6. The sale of individual containers of any size of beer, wine coolers or screw cap wine is prohibited. All such products shall remain in their original configurations as shipped by the manufacturer. Further, no repackaging of containers into groups smaller than the original shipping container size shall be permitted.
7. This business shall operate in conformance to Chapter 6.50 of the City of Las Vegas Municipal Code.
8. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied, except as modified herein.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**SUP-13410 - SPECIAL USE PERMIT - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: ARTURO VIRAY - OWNER: WMCV PHASE I, LLC** - Request for a Special Use Permit FOR A BEER/WINE/COOLER ON-SALE ESTABLISHMENT WITHIN AN EXISTING RESTAURANT at 495 South Grand Central Parkway, Suite #116 (APN 139-33-610-011), PD (Planned Development) Zone, Ward 5 (Weekly).

**C.C.: 7/12/06 – IF DENIED: P.C.: FINAL ACTION (Unless appealed within 10 days)**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Submitted after final agenda – Condition confirmation letter by Arturo S. Viray

**MOTION:**

**EVANS – APPROVED subject to conditions – UNANIMOUS with DAVENPORT excused**

**To be heard by the City Council on 7/12/2006**

**MINUTES:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE explained that these items will be considered in One Motion/One Vote and are routine public and non-public hearing items that have no protests, waivers from the Code, or condition changes by the applicant or staff. All public hearings will be opened at one time. Any person representing the applicant or a member of the Planning Commission, not in agreement with all standard conditions for the applications recommended by staff, may request to have an item removed from this part of the Agenda.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 4 – SUP-13410

**MINUTES – Continued:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing open for Item 3 [SUP-13271], Item 4 [SUP-13410], Item 5 [VAC-13136] and Item 6 [VAC-13158].

There was no discussion.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing closed for Item 3 [SUP-13271], Item 4 [SUP-13410], Item 5 [VAC-13136] and Item 6 [VAC-13158].

(6:08 – 6:11)

**1-103**

**CONDITIONS:**

Planning and Development

1. Conformance to all Minimum Requirements under LVMC Title 19.04.050 for Beer/Wine/Cooler On-Sale Establishment use.
2. This approval shall be void two years from the date of final approval, unless a building permit has been issued for the principal building on the site. An Extension of Time may be filed for consideration by the City of Las Vegas.
3. Approval of this Special Use Permit does not constitute approval of a liquor license.
4. This business shall operate in conformance to Chapter 6.50 of the City of Las Vegas Municipal Code.
5. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied, except as modified herein.



**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**VAC-13136 - VACATION - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: LOCHSA ENGINEERING - OWNER: NEVSUR, INC.** - Petition to Vacate a 15-foot public right of way at the southeast corner of Smoke Ranch Road and Buffalo Drive, Ward 4 (Brown).

**SET DATE: 6/21/06 C.C. 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Submitted after final agenda – Condition confirmation letter by Ernest A. Becker Jr.

**MOTION:**

**EVANS – APPROVED subject to conditions – UNANIMOUS with DAVENPORT excused**

**To be heard by the City Council on 7/12/2006**

**MINUTES:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE explained that these items will be considered in One Motion/One Vote and are routine public and non-public hearing items that have no protests, waivers from the Code, or condition changes by the applicant or staff. All public hearings will be opened at one time. Any person representing the applicant or a member of the Planning Commission, not in agreement with all standard conditions for the applications recommended by staff, may request to have an item removed from this part of the Agenda.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 5 – VAC-13136

**MINUTES – Continued:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing open for Item 3 [SUP-13271], Item 4 [SUP-13410], Item 5 [VAC-13136] and Item 6 [VAC-13158].

There was no discussion.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing closed for Item 3 [SUP-13271], Item 4 [SUP-13410], Item 5 [VAC-13136] and Item 6 [VAC-13158].

(6:08 – 6:11)

**1-103**

**CONDITIONS:**

1. The limits of this Petition of Vacation shall be the eastern 15 feet of Buffalo Drive, south of Smoke Ranch Road, including the spandrel area, adjacent to Assessor Parcel Number #138-22-101-001.
2. An update to the previously approved Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the recordation of the Order of Vacation for this application. Appropriate drainage easements shall be reserved if recommended by the approved Drainage Plan/Study.
3. All public improvements, if any, adjacent to and in conflict with this vacation application are to be modified, as necessary, at the applicant's expense prior to the recordation of an Order of Vacation.
4. The Order of Vacation shall not be recorded until all of the conditions of approval have been met provided, however, that conditions requiring modification of public improvements may be fulfilled for purposes of recordation by providing sufficient security for the performance thereof in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance of the City of Las Vegas. City Staff is empowered to modify this application if necessary because of technical concerns or because of other related review actions as long as current City right-of-way requirements are still complied with and the intent of the vacation application is not changed. If applicable, a five foot wide easement for public streetlight and fire hydrant purposes shall be retained on all vacation actions abutting public street corridors that will remain dedicated and available for public use. Also, if applicable and where needed, public easement corridors and sight visibility or other easements that would/should cross any right-of-way or easement being vacated must be retained.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 5 – VAC-13136

**CONDITIONS – Continued:**

5. Reservation of easements for the facilities of the various utility companies together with reasonable ingress thereto and egress there from shall be provided if required.
6. All development shall be in conformance with code requirements and design standards of all City Departments.
7. If the Order of Vacation is not recorded within one (1) year after approval by the City of Las Vegas or an Extension of Time is not granted by the Planning Director, then approval will terminate and a new petition must be submitted.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**VAC-13158 - VACATION - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER: BART MAYBIE** - Petition to Vacate a portion of the west half of Buffalo Drive south of Iron Mountain Road, Ward 6 (Ross).

**SET DATE: 6/21/06 C.C. 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Submitted after final agenda – Condition confirmation letter by Michael P. Ballisy

**MOTION:**

**EVANS – APPROVED subject to conditions – UNANIMOUS with DAVENPORT excused**

**To be heard by the City Council on 7/12/2006**

**MINUTES:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE explained that these items will be considered in One Motion/One Vote and are routine public and non-public hearing items that have no protests, waivers from the Code, or condition changes by the applicant or staff. All public hearings will be opened at one time. Any person representing the applicant or a member of the Planning Commission, not in agreement with all standard conditions for the applications recommended by staff, may request to have an item removed from this part of the Agenda.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 6 – VAC-13158

**MINUTES– Continued:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing open for Item 3 [SUP-13271], Item 4 [SUP-13410], Item 5 [VAC-13136] and Item 6 [VAC-13158]

There was no discussion.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing closed for Item 3 [SUP-13271], Item 4 [SUP-13410], Item 5 [VAC-13136] and Item 6 [VAC-13158].

(6:08 – 6:11)

**1-103**

**CONDITIONS:**

1. The limits of this vacation shall be the western 30-feet of Buffalo Drive between Maggie Avenue and Iron Mountain Road.
2. This Petition of Vacation shall be revised to retain a Public Sewer Easement over the existing public sewer stub from Silverstone Ranch Parcel 17.
3. A Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the recordation of the Order of Vacation for this application. Appropriate drainage easements shall be reserved if recommended by the approved Drainage Plan/Study.
4. All existing public improvements, if any, adjacent to and in conflict with this vacation application are to be modified, as necessary, at the applicant's expense prior to the recordation of an Order of Vacation.
5. The Order of Vacation shall not be recorded until all of the conditions of approval have been met provided, however, that conditions requiring modification of public improvements may be fulfilled for purposes of recordation by providing sufficient security for the performance thereof in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance of the City of Las Vegas. City Staff is empowered to modify this application if necessary because of technical concerns or because of other related review actions as long as current City right-of-way requirements are still complied with and the intent of the vacation application is not changed. If applicable, a five foot wide easement for public streetlight and fire hydrant purposes shall be retained on all vacation actions abutting public street corridors that will remain dedicated and available for public use. Also, if applicable and where needed, public easement corridors and sight visibility or other easements that would/should cross any right-of-way or easement being vacated must be retained.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 6 – VAC-13158

**CONDITIONS – Continued:**

6. Conformance to Extension of Time (EOT-13160) and Extension of Time (EOT-13163) and all previous approvals affecting this proposal is required.
7. Reservation of easements for the facilities of the various utility companies together with reasonable ingress thereto and egress there from shall be provided if required.
8. All development shall be in conformance with code requirements and design standards of all City Departments.
9. The Order of Vacation shall not be recorded until all of the conditions of approval have been met. City Staff is empowered to modify this application if necessary because of technical concerns or because of other related review actions as long as current City right-of-way requirements are still complied with and the intent of the vacation application is not changed. If applicable, a five-foot wide easement for public street light and fire hydrant purposes shall be retained on all vacation actions abutting public street corridors that will remain dedicated and available for public use. Also, if applicable and where needed, public easement corridors and sight visibility or other easements that would/should cross any right-of-way being vacated must be retained.
10. If the Order of Vacation is not recorded within one (1) year after approval by the City of Las Vegas or an Extension of Time is not granted by the Planning Director, then approval will terminate and a new petition must be submitted.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**ABEYANCE - GPA-12310 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER: TMF INVESTMENTS, LLC, ET AL** - Request to amend a portion of the Centennial Hills Sector Plan of the Master Plan FROM: R (RURAL DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) AND SC (SERVICE COMMERCIAL) TO: M (MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) on 5.41 acres adjacent to the west side of Decatur Boulevard between Madre Mesa Drive and Roberta Lane (APNs 138-13-701-023 and 050), Ward 5 (Weekly)

**C.C: 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

**33**

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

**0**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Multiple protest letters by Robert A. and Denise P. Johnson
6. Submitted at meeting – Protest petition with 28 signatures by Robert A. and Denise P. Johnson

**MOTION:**

**TRUEDELL – APPROVED – Motion carried with DUNNAM voting NO and DAVENPORT excused**

**To be heard by the City Council on 7/12/2006**

**MINUTES:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing open for Item 7 [GPA-12310], Item 8 [ZON-12312], Item 9 [VAR-12318], Item 10 [SDR-12316] and Item 11 [VAC-13244].

DOUG RANKIN, Planning and Development Department, stated the item was previously held in abeyance to allow time for the applicant to meet with the neighbors and make design changes.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 7 – GPA-12310

**MINUTES– Continued:**

MR. RANKIN recommended approval of the General Plan Amendment and the Rezoning since both applications are in conformance with the Master Plan east and west of the project. He recommended denial for the Variance since the project could be redesigned to address residential adjacency standards and the three-story elevation design. MR. RANKIN supported the landscape waiver buffer requirements with a request to install additional trees in the buffer area. Since the site plan is dependent upon the Variance, staff recommended denial.

DAVID TURNER, Baughman & Turner, appeared on behalf of the applicant with owner, MIKE TALBOT. He referenced a neighborhood meeting four weeks prior and noted that the biggest concern discussed was traffic. Upon meeting with the school district, it was clarified that the proposal was suitable for the subject property. At the neighbor's request, he agreed to construct a pedestrian crossing along Roberta Lane.

MR. TURNER commented on discussions with O.C. WHITE pertaining to the traffic concerns at Rancho Drive and Decatur Boulevard. MR. TURNER stated that Madre Mesa Drive is too close to Rancho Drive, therefore eliminating the possibility of adding a traffic light. He expressed understanding of an added condition requiring an island prohibiting left hand turns off Madre Mesa Drive onto Decatur Boulevard.

Regarding residential adjacency standards, MR. TURNER stated the required 105 feet distance would require nearly half of the subject property that was recently purchased to fit the project. Because the residential adjacency issue was not a major concern to the neighbors, the project was not redesigned to accommodate that compliance. He explained the three-story elevation is the same throughout with some units consisting of a loft. By Code, the project is considered a three-story elevation, but the building heights or elevations would not change with or without a loft. MR. TURNER stated that the site is allowed up to 24 units per acre where only 18 units are presented and he requested approval.

BERNARD OPIE, 2664 Los Palos Street, expressed understanding for the Rezoning application and supported the proposed elevations pertaining to the height of the building, as described by MR. TURNER. MR. OPIE objected to the residential adjacency and landscape waivers and requested clarification about whether the project would consist of apartments or condominiums and the prices of rent.

ROBERT JOHNSON, 5060 Jean Avenue, stated he was not informed about the neighborhood meeting conducted by the developer. Because there was not a genuine effort to meet with all concerned neighbors, he objected to all requests.



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 7 – GPA-12310

**MINUTES– Continued:**

LAURIE DUFRENE, 5015 Roberta Drive, stated she does not oppose the project, but objected to the landscape and adjacency waivers requested.

SHEILA PAVELL, 5080 Jean Avenue, expressed concern about the possibility of overcrowding the nearby school. Although they were able to obtain support from the school district, MS. PAVELL stated she is opposed to having numerous portables at one school and this development would increase the likelihood of having another portable at the nearby school.

MR. TURNER confirmed that he spoke with CAROL BAILEY from the Clark County School District who stated that there is no real concern for the development of the project in conjunction with space availability in the nearby school.

MIKE TALBOT, Senior Managing Partner of TMF Investments, confirmed the only portion of the site affected by the one-foot landscaping is adjacent to the post office. He explained that the reason for the distance separation is because 105 feet would take up the two thirds of developable space. The request is justified since there would be over 80 feet separating the residents from the development side yard setbacks, a drainage way and landscaping. In summary, 45 feet would separate their property line from the proposed development.

MR. TALBOT announced the project's intent to become a tremendous apartment complex. The elevations are attractive, the complex would be contained within walls and provide single access via Madre Mesa.

At the request of COMMISSIONER EVANS, STEVE ALLEN, Talk Development, 10140 Stony Ridge Drive, responded that he attended the meeting with the Clark County School District. He confirmed that MS. BAILEY stated they expect for only 25 percent of the units to have children in school.

COMMISSIONER EVANS questioned if any of the units would be able to view the homes of adjacent residents. MR. TALBOT responded that the height restriction is currently met and the windows for the apartments are to be positioned high since they are intended for light and ventilation purposes only and there should be no privacy issues.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 7 – GPA-12310

**MINUTES– Continued:**

LINDA AUSTIN, 5075 Roberta Lane, noted that she and many others in her neighborhood oppose the development of apartments. She stated that the project would not be appropriate for the community. JEFF TRUJILLO, 5095 Roberta Lane, concurred with the previous speakers opposing the project.

COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL commented that although many in opposition do not support the development of apartments, it is usually the maintenance and management of apartments that allow a complex to become an eyesore. While COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL did not oppose the project simply because they wish to develop apartments, he did not support the project because of the poor design requiring so many waivers.

COMMISSIONER EVANS concurred with COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL'S comments. In this case, the developer has created a hardship for himself which can be avoided with the proposal of a different design.

COMMISSIONER GOYNES expressed several concerns as to what securities would ensure that this project remains a quality development for years to come.

DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY JAMES LEWIS informed the Commissioners that it is the applicant's burden to explain the legislative determinations that deem their variance requests worthy of approval. COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL commended the applicant for seeking to develop this infill parcel and putting forth additional efforts to have County land annexed into the City to accomplish the proposed development; however, the design of the parcel can be altered to provide a solution.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE acknowledged his understanding of the reasons provided that substantiate the waiver requests, but concurred that a better design would eliminate many concerns. MR. RANKIN noted that along Madre Mesa Drive, the design reflects a sidewalk feature that includes a landscape planter of 10 feet. This occurs twice within the project and because there is landscaping behind the sidewalk, he supported the waiver request.

COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL suggested abeying the waiver requests and site review plans for 30 days in an attempt to allow the applicant time to redesign the project. Therefore, Items 9 [VAR-12318] and Item 10 [SDR-12316] were held in abeyance.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing closed for Item 7 [GPA-12310], Item 8 [ZON-12312], Item 9 [VAR-12318], Item 10 [SDR-12316] and Item 11 [VAC-13244].

(6:11 – 6:58)

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**ABEYANCE - ZON-12312 - REZONING RELATED TO GPA-12310 - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER: TMF INVESTMENTS, LLC, ET AL** - Request for a Rezoning FROM: R-E (RESIDENCE ESTATES); U (UNDEVELOPED) [M (MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) MASTER PLAN DESIGNATION]; AND U (UNDEVELOPED) [SC (SERVICE COMMERCIAL) MASTER PLAN DESIGNATION] UNDER RESOLUTION OF INTENT TO C-1 (LIMITED COMMERCIAL) TO: R-3 (MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) on 10.53 acres adjacent to the west side of Decatur Boulevard between Madre Mesa Drive and Roberta Lane (APNs 138-13-701-023, 045, 050, and 057), Ward 5 (Weekly).

**C.C.: 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>33</b>

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Multiple protest letters by Robert A. and Denise P. Johnson
6. Submitted at meeting – Protest petition with 28 signatures by Robert A. and Denise P. Johnson for Items 7 through 11 filed under Item 7

**MOTION:**

**TRUESDELL – APPROVED subject to conditions – Motion carried with DUNNAM voting NO and DAVENPORT excused**

**To be heard by the City Council on 7/12/2006**

**MINUTES:**

NOTE: See Item 7 [GPA-12310] for all related discussion.

(6:11 – 6:58)

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 8 – ZON-12312

**CONDITIONS:**

Planning and Development

1. A General Plan Amendment (GPA-12310) to an M (Medium Density Residential) land use designation approved by the City Council.
2. A Resolution of Intent with a two-year time limit is hereby granted.
3. A Site Development Plan Review (SDR-12316) application approved by the City of Las Vegas is required prior to issuance of any permits, any site grading, and all development activity for the site.

Public Works

4. Dedicate 30-feet of right-of-way adjacent to this site for those portions of Madre Mesa Drive not previously dedicated prior to the issuance of any permits.
5. Construct all incomplete street improvements on Madre Mesa Drive, Decatur Boulevard and Roberta Lane adjacent to this site concurrent with development of this site. Install all appurtenant underground facilities, if any, adjacent to this site needed for the future traffic signal system concurrent with development of this site. All existing paving damaged or removed by this development shall be restored at its original location and to its original width concurrent with development of this site. Extend all required underground utilities, such as electrical, telephone, etc., located within public rights-of-way, past the boundaries of this site prior to construction of hard surfacing (asphalt or concrete).
6. A Traffic Impact Analysis must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, submittal of any construction drawings or the recordation of a Map subdividing this site. Comply with the recommendations of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis prior to occupancy of the site. The Traffic Impact Analysis shall also include a section addressing Standard Drawings #234.1 #234.2 and #234.3 to determine additional right-of-way requirements for bus turnouts adjacent to this site, if any; dedicate all areas recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. All additional rights of way required by Standard Drawing #201.1 for exclusive right turn lanes and dual left turn lanes shall be dedicated prior to or concurrent with the commencement of on site development activities unless specifically noted as not required in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. If additional rights of way are not required and Traffic Control devices are or may be proposed at this site outside of the public right of way, all necessary easements for the location and/or access of such devices shall be granted prior to the issuance of permits for this site. Phased compliance will be allowed if recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. No recommendation of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis, nor compliance therewith, shall be deemed to modify or

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 8 – ZON-12312

**CONDITIONS – Continued:**

eliminate any condition of approval imposed by the Planning Commission or the City Council on the development of this site.

7. A Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, submittal of any construction drawings or the submittal of a Map subdividing this site, whichever may occur first. Provide and improve all drainageways recommended in the approved drainage plan/study. The developer of this site shall be responsible to construct such neighborhood or local drainage facility improvements as are recommended by the City of Las Vegas Neighborhood Drainage Studies and approved Drainage Plan/Study concurrent with development of this site. In lieu of constructing improvements, in whole or in part, the developer may agree to contribute monies for the construction of neighborhood or local drainage improvements, the amount of such monies shall be determined by the approved Drainage Plan/Study and shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, or the recordation of a Map subdividing this site, whichever may occur first, if allowed by the City Engineer.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**ABEYANCE - VAR-12318 - VARIANCE RELATED TO GPA-12310 AND ZON-12312 - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER: TMF INVESTMENTS, LLC, ET AL -**

Request for a Variance TO ALLOW A RESIDENTIAL ADJACENCY SETBACK OF 20 FEET WHERE A 105-FOOT SETBACK IS THE MINIMUM SETBACK REQUIRED AND TO ALLOW THREE STORIES WHERE A MAXIMUM OF TWO STORIES IS ALLOWED on 10.53 acres adjacent to the west side of Decatur Boulevard between Madre Mesa Drive and Roberta Lane (APNs 138-13-701-023, 045, 050, and 057), R-E (Residence Estates) Zone, U (Undeveloped) Zone [M (Medium Density Residential) Master Plan Designation], and U (Undeveloped) Zone [SC (Service Commercial) Master Plan Designation] under Resolution of Intent to C-1 (Limited Commercial) Zone [PROPOSED: R-3 (Medium Density Residential) Zone], Ward 5 (Weekly).

**C.C.: 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

**33**

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

**0**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends DENIAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Multiple protest letters by Robert A. and Denise P. Johnson
6. Submitted at meeting – Protest petition with 28 signatures by Robert A. and Denise P. Johnson for Items 7 through 11 filed under Item 7

**MOTION:**

**TRUEDELL – ABEYANCE to 7/13/2006 – UNANIMOUS with DAVENPORT excused**

**To be heard by the Planning Commission on 7/13/2006**

**MINUTES:**

NOTE: See Item 7 [GPA-12310] for all related discussion.  
 (6:11 – 6:58)

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**ABEYANCE - SDR-12316 - SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW RELATED TO GPA-12310, ZON-12312, AND VAR-12318 - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER: TMF INVESTMENTS, LLC, ET AL** - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR A PROPOSED 200-UNIT APARTMENT PROJECT AND A WAIVER TO ALLOW A ONE-FOOT PERIMETER LANDSCAPE BUFFER WHERE SIX FEET IS THE MINIMUM LANDSCAPE BUFFER WIDTH REQUIRED AND TO ALLOW A 10-FOOT BUFFER WHERE 15 FEET IS THE MINIMUM WIDTH REQUIRED on 10.53 acres adjacent to the west side of Decatur Boulevard between Madre Mesa Drive and Roberta Lane (APNs 138-13-701-023, 045, 050, and 057), R-E (Residence Estates) Zone, U (Undeveloped) Zone [M (Medium Density Residential) Master Plan Designation], U (Undeveloped) Zone [SC (Service Commercial) Master Plan Designation] under Resolution of Intent to C-1 (Limited Commercial) Zone [PROPOSED: R-3 (Medium Density Residential) Zone], Ward 5 (Weekly).

**C.C.: 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

<b>Planning Commission Mtg.</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>City Council Meeting</b>	

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

<b>Planning Commission Mtg.</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>City Council Meeting</b>	

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends DENIAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Multiple protest letters by Robert A. and Denise P. Johnson
6. Submitted at meeting – Protest petition with 28 signatures by Robert A. and Denise P. Johnson for Items 7 through 11 filed under Item 7

**MOTION:**

**TRUEDELL – ABEYANCE to 7/13/2006 – UNANIMOUS with DAVENPORT excused**

**To be heard by the Planning Commission on 7/13/2006**

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 10 – SDR-12316

**MINUTES:**

NOTE: See Item 7 [GPA-12310] for all related discussion.

(6:11 – 6:58)

**1-207**



**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**VAC-13244 - VACATION RELATED TO GPA-12310, ZON-12312, VAR-12318 AND SDR-12136 - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: TMF INVESTMENTS, LLC, ET AL - OWNER: DECATUR VILLAGE/TMF INVESTMENTS** - Petition to Vacate two 20-foot wide drainage easements generally located on the north side of Roberta Drive, approximately 680 feet west of Decatur Boulevard, Ward 5 (Weekly).

**SET DATE: 6/21/06 C.C. 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

**33**

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

**0**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Multiple protest letters by Robert A. and Denise P. Johnson
6. Submitted at meeting – Protest petition with 28 signatures by Robert A. and Denise P. Johnson for Items 7 through 11 filed under Item 7

**MOTION:**

**TRUEDELL – APPROVED subject to conditions – UNANIMOUS with DAVENPORT excused**

**To be heard by the City Council on 7/12/2006**

**MINUTES:**

NOTE: See Item 7 [GPA-12310] for all related discussion.

(6:11 – 6:58)

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 11 – VAC-13244

**CONDITIONS:**

1. The limits of this Petition of Vacation shall be described as the two public drainage easements generally located on the north side of Roberta Lane, west of Decatur Boulevard.
2. A Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the recordation of the Order of Vacation for this application. Appropriate drainage easements shall be reserved if recommended by the approved Drainage Plan/Study. The drainage study required by ZON-12312 may be used to satisfy this requirement provided that it addresses the area to be vacated.
3. All public improvements, if any, adjacent to and in conflict with this vacation application are to be modified, as necessary, at the applicant's expense prior to the recordation of an Order of Vacation.
4. The Order of Vacation shall not be recorded until all of the conditions of approval have been met provided, however, that conditions requiring modification of public improvements may be fulfilled for purposes of recordation by providing sufficient security for the performance thereof in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance of the City of Las Vegas. City Staff is empowered to modify this application if necessary because of technical concerns or because of other related review actions as long as current City right-of-way requirements are still complied with and the intent of the vacation application is not changed. If applicable, a five foot wide easement for public streetlight and fire hydrant purposes shall be retained on all vacation actions abutting public street corridors that will remain dedicated and available for public use. Also, if applicable and where needed, public easement corridors and sight visibility or other easements that would/should cross any right-of-way or easement being vacated must be retained.
5. All development shall be in conformance with code requirements and design standards of all City Departments.
6. The Order of Vacation shall not be recorded until all of the conditions of approval have been met. City Staff is empowered to modify this application if necessary because of technical concerns or because of other related review actions as long as current City right-of-way requirements are still complied with and the intent of the vacation application is not changed. If applicable, a five-foot wide easement for public street light and fire hydrant purposes shall be retained on all vacation actions abutting public street corridors that will remain dedicated and available for public use. Also, if applicable and where needed, public easement corridors and sight

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 11 – VAC-13244

**CONDITIONS – Continued:**

visibility or other easements that would/should cross any right-of-way being vacated must be retained.

7. If the Order of Vacation is not recorded within one (1) year after approval by the City of Las Vegas or an Extension of Time is not granted by the Planning Director, then approval will terminate and a new petition must be submitted.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**ABEYANCE - RENOTIFICATION - SDR-11676 - SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER: BELL REAL ESTATE, LLC -**

Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR A PROPOSED 25,906 SQUARE FOOT AUTO REPAIR GARAGE (MAJOR), A 1,208-SPACE PARKING GARAGE AND A WAIVER OF THE DOWNTOWN CENTENNIAL PLAN STEPBACK REQUIREMENT on 1.77 acres at 2030, 2112, 2100, and 2114 Industrial Road (APNs 162-04-704-008; 162-04-802-001, 002, 003 and 004), M (Industrial) Zone, Ward 1 (Tarkanian). NOTE: THIS APPLICATION IS BEING RE-NOTIFIED TO INCREASE THE SQUARE FOOTAGE OF THE AUTO REPAIR GARAGE USE TO 41,777 SQUARE FEET.

**C.C.: 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Peak Development Letter dated 5-25-06

**MOTION:**

**EVANS – APPROVED** subject to conditions – **UNANIMOUS** with **DAVENPORT** excused

**NOTE: COMMISSIONER DUNNAM** disclosed that he knows **BRENT BELL** but has not spoken to him about the project and would vote on the item.

**To be heard by the City Council on 7/12/2006**

**MINUTES:**

**CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE** declared the Public Hearing open.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 12 – SDR-11676

**MINUTES – Continued:**

DOUG RANKIN, Planning and Development Department, stated the item was previously held in abeyance to allow the applicant time to address the employee parking concern and provide information regarding satellite parking lots. MR. RANKIN noted that the applicant submitted a letter with that information but the letter was difficult to interpret. He recommended approval of the site plan and stepback waiver.

BRENT BELL, 1900 Industrial Road, appeared with LANDON CHRISTOPHERSON, 6402 McLeod Drive, on behalf of the applicant. MR. CHRISTOPHERSON explained there are 289 employee parking spaces and an additional 150 available at 1900 Industrial Road totaling 439 employee parking spaces. He clarified that the parking structure would only supply 1,186 parking spaces.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE inquired about the intent of the 439 parking spaces that are at five different sites. MR. CHRISTOPHERSON confirmed they plan to use existing satellite parking until growth requires that they expand to additional spaces in the garage. CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE was still concerned about the company's growth and questioned where oversized vehicles would be parked. MR. BELL responded that the site would be redesigned and restriped to allow for bus parking outside the garage.

COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL noted there are remote lots within a quarter mile designated for employees. He questioned if approving this project would increase employee demand, which would increase the burden on the surface street parking within the residential areas to the east. MR. CHRISTOPHERSON stated that all employees of Presidential Limousine currently park at 2030 Industrial Road, as the garage is designated for administrative employees, mechanics and shop personnel. The new garage is planned to accommodate more spaces for future employee growth. COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL stated that this application would create peak time traffic and safety burdens. He inquired about the removal of the onsite billboard, and MR. CHRISTOPHERSON confirmed the billboard would be removed.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing closed.

(6:58 – 7:11)

**1-1873**

**CONDITIONS:**

Planning and Development

1. This Site Development Plan Review shall expire two years from date of final approval unless it is exercised or an Extension of Time is granted by the City of Las Vegas
2. All development shall be in conformance with the site plan and building elevations, date stamped 02/06/06, except as amended by conditions herein.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 12 – SDR-11676

**CONDITIONS – Continued:**

3. A Waiver from the Downtown Centennial Plan is hereby approved, to allow no building step-back where a five-foot step-back is required at the fourth floor.
4. The conceptual landscape plan shall be revised and approved by Planning and Development Department staff, prior to the time application is made for a building permit, to reflect the required streetscape treatment as outlined by Section DS4 of the Downtown Centennial Plan. A five-foot landscaped amenity zone and an 11-foot wide sidewalk are required along Industrial Road. The amenity area shall be planted with a minimum of 25-foot tall Palm Trees located a maximum of 35 feet on-center. Shade trees may be provided in double or single rows between palm trees if desired.
5. A permanent underground sprinkler system shall be installed in all landscape areas as required by the City of Las Vegas and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner.
6. A technical landscape plan, signed and sealed by a Registered Architect, Landscape Architect, Residential Designer or Civil Engineer, must be submitted prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit. The landscape plan shall include irrigation specifications.
7. Pre-planting and post-planting landscape inspections are required to ensure the appropriate plant material, location, size of planters, and landscape plans are being utilized. The Planning and Development must be contacted to schedule an inspection prior to the start of the landscape installation and after the landscape installation is completed. A certificate of occupancy will not be issued or the final inspection will not be approved until the landscape inspections have been completed.
8. Reflective glazing at the pedestrian level is prohibited. Glazing above the pedestrian level shall be limited to a maximum reflectance of 22% (as defined by the National Institute of Standards and Technology).
9. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be fully screened in views from the abutting streets.
10. All utility boxes exceeding 27 cubic feet in size shall meet the standards of Municipal Code Section 19.12.050.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 12 – SDR-11676

**CONDITIONS – Continued:**

11. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures.
12. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied.

Public Works

13. Coordinate with the City Surveyor to determine the appropriate mapping method for this site prior to the issuance of any permits; comply with the recommendations of the City Surveyor.
14. Remove all substandard public street improvements and unused driveway cuts adjacent to this site, if any, and replace with new improvements meeting current City Standards concurrent with development of this site.
15. Coordinate with the City Engineers office for information regarding the possible future widening of Industrial Road; comply with the recommendations of the City Engineer.
16. The proposed driveway shall be designed, located and constructed in accordance with Standard Drawing #222a.
17. All landscaping installed with this project shall be situated and maintained so as to not create sight visibility obstructions for vehicular traffic at all development access drives and abutting street intersections.
18. Meet with the Flood Control Section of the Department of Public Works for assistance with establishing finished floor elevations and drainage patterns for this site prior to submittal of construction plans or the issuance of any building or grading permits, whichever may occur first. Provide and improve all drainage ways as recommended.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**MOD-12919 - MAJOR MODIFICATION - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT:**  
**DORSAL DEVELOPMENT, LLC - OWNER: FULLSTONE 1993 TRUST AND JEFF**  
**SELLINGER** - Request for a Major Modification to the Las Vegas Medical District Plan TO AMEND THE LAND USE DESIGNATION FROM: MD-2 (MAJOR MEDICAL) TO: MD-1 (MEDICAL SUPPORT) on 0.74 acre at 728 Desert Lane (APN 139-33-402-021), Ward 5 (Weekly)

**C.C.: 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

Planning Commission Mtg.  
City Council Meeting

**1**

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

Planning Commission Mtg.  
City Council Meeting

**0**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Submitted after final agenda – Opposition letter by L. Earl Hawley

**MOTION:**

**EVANS – Motion to HOLD IN ABEYANCE Item 28 [VAR-12782] to 6/22/2006; Item 13 [MOD-12919], Item 14 [VAR-12925], Item 15 [SDR-12922] to 7/13/2006; and TABLE Item 29 [TXT-13518] – UNANIMOUS**

**MINUTES:**

The applicant of Item 13 [MOD-12919], Item 14 [VAR-12925] and Item 15 [SDR-12922] requested an abeyance to 7/13/2006 because a necessary application is needed for the Special Use Permit and the applicant is revising the plans.

(6:06 – 6:07)



**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**VAR-12925 - VARIANCE RELATED TO MOD-12919 - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: DORSAL DEVELOPMENT, LLC - OWNER: FULLSTONE 1993 TRUST AND JEFF SELLINGER** - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW 85 PARKING SPACES WHERE 100 IS THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES REQUIRED on 0.74 acre at 728 Desert Lane (APN 139-33-402-021), PD (Planned Development) Zone [MD-2 (Major Medical) Las Vegas Medical District Special Land Use Designation] [PROPOSED: MD-1 (Medical Support) Las Vegas Medical District Special Land Use Designation], Ward 5 (Weekly).

**C.C.: 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

**1**

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

**0**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends DENIAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Submitted after final agenda – Opposition letter by L. Earl Hawley for Item 13 through 15 filed under Item 13

**MOTION:**

**EVANS – Motion to HOLD IN ABEYANCE Item 28 [VAR-12782] to 6/22/2006; Item 13 [MOD-12919], Item 14 [VAR-12925], Item 15 [SDR-12922] to 7/13/2006; and TABLE Item 29 [TXT-13518] – UNANIMOUS**

**MINUTES:**

The applicant of Item 13 [MOD-12919], Item 14 [VAR-12925] and Item 15 [SDR-12922] requested an abeyance to 7/13/2006 because a necessary application is needed for the Special Use Permit and the applicant is revising the plans.

(6:06 – 6:07)

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**SDR-12922 - SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW RELATED TO MOD-12919 AND VAR-12925 - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: DORSAL DEVELOPMENT, LLC - OWNER: FULLSTONE 1993 TRUST AND JEFF SELLINGER** - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR A PROPOSED FIVE-STORY MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT CONSISTING OF 24 RESIDENTIAL CONDOMINIUM UNITS AND 13,465 SQUARE FEET OF MEDICAL OFFICE SPACE on 0.74 acre at 728 Desert Lane (APN 139-33-402-021), PD (Planned Development) Zone [MD-2 (Major Medical) Las Vegas Medical District Special Land Use Designation] [PROPOSED: MD-1 (Medical Support) Las Vegas Medical District Special Land Use Designation], Ward 5 (Weekly).

**C.C.: 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>1</b>

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends DENIAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Submitted after final agenda – Opposition letter by L. Earl Hawley for Item 13 through 15 filed under Item 13

**MOTION:**

**EVANS – Motion to HOLD IN ABEYANCE Item 28 [VAR-12782] to 6/22/2006; Item 13 [MOD-12919], Item 14 [VAR-12925], Item 15 [SDR-12922] to 7/13/2006; and TABLE Item 29 [TXT-13518] – UNANIMOUS**

**MINUTES:**

The applicant of Item 13 [MOD-12919], Item 14 [VAR-12925] and Item 15 [SDR-12922] requested an abeyance to 7/13/2006 because a necessary application is needed for the Special Use Permit and the applicant is revising the plans.

(6:06 – 6:07)

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**VAR-12102 - VARIANCE - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: TRIPLE FIVE DEVELOPMENT - OWNER: VILLAGE SQUARE BUILDING P, LLC** - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW 2,404 PARKING SPACES WHERE 2,440 IS THE MINIMUM REQUIRED after the addition of a 1,200 square foot restaurant within an existing commercial center on 36.8 acres at 9440 West Sahara Avenue (APN 163-06-816-002, -003, -004, -005, -007, -009, -011, -013, -015, -017, -019, -020, -024, -025, -026, -027, -029, -030, -031, -032, -033, -034, -035, and -036), C-1 (Limited Commercial) Zone, Ward 2 (Wolfson).

**C.C.: 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>1</b>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends DENIAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Submitted after final agenda – Support by Brichon Browne
6. Submitted at meeting – Silver State Traffic Data Collection and site information by James Grindstaff

**MOTION:**

**STEINMAN – APPROVED subject to conditions – UNANIMOUS with DAVENPORT excused**

**To be heard by the City Council on 7/12/2006**

**MINUTES:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing open.

SETH FLOYD, Planning and Development Department, explained the need for this variance is self imposed because the addition could have been designed to avoid the variance. The site is currently parking impaired and he recommended denial.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 16 – VAR-12102

**MINUTES – Continued:**

JAMES GRINDSTAFF, 9440 West Sahara Avenue, outlined the timeline of events that led up to this application request. He stated that a high demand for restaurants now encouraged a plan to replace the plans for retail development. MR. GRINDSTAFF submitted a traffic study conducted by Silver State Traffic, which reflected ample parking excluding the dates of big movie releases. There are nearly 272 underutilized parking spaces behind the theater and, upon approval, there would be signs directing traffic to the rear. He detailed comparisons of County Codes and City Codes that were labeled on the study to note that the revision of the Code now makes the site parking impaired.

COMMISSIONER STEINMAN requested further detail of the traffic study, and MR. GRINDSTAFF explained that the theater is the most intense use on the site. The site creating the burden is labeled as Pad P and the areas in green would impact the theater and Pad P the most. COMMISSIONER STEINMAN and CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE confirmed that the theater attracts many to that plaza but would accommodate the request.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing closed.

(7:11 – 7:21)

**1-2404**

**CONDITIONS:**

Planning and Development

1. This approval shall be void one year from the date of final approval, unless a business license has been issued to conduct the activity, if required, or upon approval of a final inspection. An Extension of Time may be filed for consideration by the City of Las Vegas.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**VAR-13201 - VARIANCE - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: MALCO ENTERPRISES NEVADA, INC - OWNER: J & L PROPERTY LEASING, LLC** - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW A 55 FOOT FREESTANDING SIGN WHERE 40 FEET IS THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT ALLOWED on 2.55 acres at 5600 West Sahara Avenue (APN 163-01-404-014 and 163-01-404-021), C-2 (General Commercial) Zone, Ward 1 (Tarkanian).

**P.C. FINAL ACTION (unless appealed within 10 days)**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>1</b>

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends DENIAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter

**MOTION:**

**TRUEDELL – DENIED – UNANIMOUS with DAVENPORT excused**

**This is Final Action**

**MINUTES:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing open.

SETH FLOYD, Planning and Development Department, stated this application is the result of a self-imposed hardship and an alternate design could comply with the 40-foot maximum height restriction. Exceeding the height limitation does not comply with the objective to improve sign quality, visibility and appearance of the City's thoroughfares. He recommended denial.

MARK WHITEHOUSE, 3555 West Naples, stated that along Sahara Avenue there are several signs that exceed the maximum height restriction and the site plan is in close proximity of the Hummer Dealership that recently erected a 50-foot sign and 40-foot palm trees. MR. WHITEHOUSE requested the sign be raised in an effort to be more visible.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 17 – VAR-13201

**MINUTES – Continued:**

GARY SWANCIGER, 2270 Westwind Road, recalled the Hummer dealership's compromise, which was to eliminate the option of having two signs for the allowance of one 50-foot sign. He stated that the existing sign on the subject property consists of an LCD sign that is a nuisance. MR. SWANCIGER opposed the request and suggested the existing sign be redesigned.

COMMISSIONER EVANS questioned if the sign would be visible from his residence and MR. SWANCIGER explained that the building sits on a higher elevation and currently blocks the existing sign. If the sign were approved at a height of 55 feet, it would be visible from his home. MR. WHITEHOUSE disputed the probability that the sign would be visible if it were 55 feet tall.

LAURA MALLOW, 2317 Timberline Way, Vice President, stated that the Hummer dealership's palm trees block a significant portion of the subject property. MS. MALLOW respectfully requested approval.

COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL commented on the approval of the Hummer dealership and stated he regretted his vote of support. The City must obtain control over the standards imposed for businesses along Sahara Avenue. He specified that the Code offers a benefit for the Commissioners to consider upon the Hummer dealership's agreement to consolidate two signs. He did not support the request. COMMISSIONER EVANS concurred with COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL and added that there should be a greater degree of aesthetic pride for the City, considering its robust economy.

MR. WHITEHOUSE argued that the Hummer dealership's approval created a hardship for Kia. DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY JAMES LEWIS reminded everyone that all discussions should be relevant to the application in question and not the approval of another's request.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing closed.

(7:21 – 7:35)

**1-2907**

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**VAR-13203 - VARIANCE - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: TUFF SHED, INC - OWNER: KEVIN L. SMITH** - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW A 19 FOOT, 2 INCH PROPOSED ACCESSORY STRUCTURE THAT EXCEEDS THE HEIGHT OF THE 10 FOOT, 6 INCH MAIN DWELLING on 0.17 acre at 4217 West Oakey Boulevard (APN 162-06-710-010), R-1 (Single Family Residence) Zone, Ward 1 (Tarkanian).

**P.C. FINAL ACTION (unless appealed within 10 days)**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>31</b>

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends DENIAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Submitted after final agenda – Letters of opposition by Atsuko Koga and Mike Mc Caw
6. Submitted at meeting – Support petition with 29 signatures and neighborhood exhibit of supportive residents by Kevin L. Smith

**MOTION:**

**TRUESELL – ABEYANCE to 6/22/2006 – UNANIMOUS with DAVENPORT excused**

**To be heard by the Planning Commission on 6/22/2006**

**MINUTES:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing open.

SETH FLOYD, Planning and Development Department, explained that the request does not comply with the character of the neighborhood, which consists of one story dwellings with heights under 12 feet; therefore, staff found that the proposed 19 foot 2 inch accessory structure is not harmonious with the surrounding area as the structure would be clearly visible from the adjacent property. Furthermore, the hardship is self-imposed and an alternative design would allow compliance with Title 19. Staff recommended denial.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 18 – VAR-13203

**MINUTES – Continued:**

VALERIE LIVENGOD, 1592 Mapleleaf Street, appeared on behalf of the applicant and the owner, and stated that her client would like to erect an accessory structure in the rear yard of his home that exceeds the height of the main dwelling. She clarified that the structure will not look like a red barn or shed. Top quality materials will be used that will match the existing structure; same color sidings, wood trim, and roofing. Even though the structure will be taller than the existing structure, it will not be out of character given the fact of existing power poles and tall palm trees within this mature neighborhood. Her client's home is small and the proposed structure would provide for additional storage space and the ability to work on his cars and avoid creating a nuisance in front of his home. MS. LIVENGOD indicated other homes have dilapidated sheds that can be seen from the street, as well as broken cars placed on blocks.

MS. LIVENGOD discussed with COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL that Tuff Shed's design model name is referred to as their "Tall Barn". The Commissioner indicated that if the design of the building was different it would probably comply with the Code. The proposed structure is significantly higher than the residence and will visibly impact the area. MS. LIVENGOD replied that her client cannot go wider or lower because of the pool in his backyard. She reiterated that the material used would be similar to those used in other structures in the neighborhood.

TODD HARDGROVE, Sales Consultant for Tuff Shed, stated the architectural design of the proposed structure would provide overhead storage, which is not available with the standard design.

KEVIN SMITH, 4217 West Oakey Boulevard, submitted a petition with 29 signatures supporting the project. MS. LIVENGOD added that MR. SMITH personally obtained support from his neighbors.

COMMISSIONER EVANS stated that the applicant would be erecting a 19-foot barn on a major thoroughfare. There are other ways a structure could be developed that would fit into the architecture of the neighborhood and be less obtrusive. Therefore, he would not support the request.

COMMISSIONER STEINMAN verified with MR. SMITH that he would mainly use the structure for storage and occasionally work on his cars. The Commissioner noted that the Tuff Shed structure resembles a barn and is not compatible with the home. MR. HARDGROVE pointed out that a ranch style design is still limited 12 to 14 feet.



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 18 – VAR-13203

**MINUTES – Continued:**

COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL suggested tabling or abeying the item. MS. LIVENGOOD opted to hold the item for two weeks and provide staff with the revised elevation by Monday.

VICE-CHAIRMAN EVANS announced he would support the abeyance motion; however, because Oakey Boulevard is a very visible and traveled area, the structure does will not blend in. Therefore, it is unlikely that this application would see his support.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing closed.

(7:35 – 7:50)

**2-37**

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**VAR-13245 - VARIANCE - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER:**  
**WARMINGTON HOMES OF NEVADA** - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW 220 SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGS WITH SIDE YARD SETBACKS OF TWO FEET WHERE THREE FEET IS THE MINIMUM SETBACK REQUIRED on 20.9 acres at the southwest corner of Hualapai Way and Farm Road (APN 126-13-710-001), PD (Planned Development) Zone, Ward 6 (Ross).

**P.C. FINAL ACTION (unless appealed within 10 days)**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

Planning Commission Mtg.  
City Council Meeting

**0**

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

Planning Commission Mtg.  
City Council Meeting

**0**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends DENIAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter

**MOTION:**

**STEINMAN – DENIED – UNANIMOUS with DAVENPORT excused**

**This is Final Action**

**MINUTES:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing open.

SETH FLOYD, Planning and Development Department, stated that no evidence of a unique or extraordinary circumstance has been presented; therefore, the applicant has created a self-imposed hardship by designing the development with buildings that do not conform to the setback requirements. An alternative design would allow conformance to the Cliff's Edge Development Standards. He noted that if the application is approved, the eaves must be

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 19 – VAR-13245

**MINUTES – Continued:**

appropriately fire-rated due to the proximity to the property line. To ensure compliance, he suggested a condition to state that per Section R 302.1 of the Unified Building Code, any projection extending into the three-foot fire separation distance measured from the property line shall have not less than one hour fire resistant construction on the underside and shall not extend to a point closer than two feet from the property line. Staff recommended denial.

MARGO WHEELER, Director of Planning and Development Department, added that in this case there was a debate whether or not a variance covering multiple properties was appropriate. There have been other modifications in Cliff's Edge and she recommended that if any variances are considered, they should be on a case-by-case basis where an individual product could be viewed on individual properties.

MARK BANGAN, L.R. Nelson, 6765 West Russell Road, #200, appeared on behalf of the applicant and clarified that the proposed homes are 3.75 feet away from the property lines. The Providence Master Plan has a 12-inch eave requirement for every property. Working together with the Providence Master Plan, they have been able to go back ten inches. They did include an extra nine inches on three of the plans and on one of them they have an additional foot and nine inches. Three of the plans require this Variance, but one does not, and they are willing to fire-rate the eaves.

COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL discussed with MR. BANGAN that if they would have met the standards of the master plan and had the 12-inch overhang, the density of the project would be reduced approximately 18 to 20. The Commissioner commented that much effort is put into developing a master plan and developers are aware of that master plan; however, it seems that every project that comes before the Planning Commission needs a variance. A master plan is developed to give a better quality of life to a community. MR. BARGAN replied there will be three feet and nine inches between the building and the wall. When they originally submitted architectural designs with Providence, a preliminary approval was granted by Providence with the eaves as proposed. Afterward they requested larger eaves.

COMMISSIONER EVANS commented that in this area of town the homes are dense. His concern is public safety. It was recommended that they provide automatic sprinkler system. He wanted assurance that the public is protected in the event a fire should start in one of these homes, and that the entire neighborhood will not be affected by the fire, especially when these homes are built closer together. MR. BANGAN replied he was not able to answer these questions. He pointed out that similar projects have been developed in the County and North Las Vegas, and that he has received comments from the fire chiefs of these jurisdictions, as well as

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 19 – VAR-13245

**MINUTES – Continued:**

the City of Las Vegas. The proposed buildings will have fire-rated eaves with stucco wrapped around them to provide the one-hour fire rating needed to withstand the fire and give the fire department time to respond. This would limit fire damages. MR. BANGAN verified with COMMISSIONER EVANS that the private streets can accommodate fire trucks, which is not being given any consideration.

COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL reiterated that time is being wasted on the Master Plan. A plan was adopted by the Planning Commission and now is being requested that it be changed. He reiterated that a Master Plan is designed to create a quality of life community.

COMMISSIONER STEINMAN asked why the wall of the house could not be moved over six to 12 inches. MR. BANGAN replied he could propose this to his client. DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY JAMES LEWIS reminded the Commission that when an applicant brings forth a Variance, the applicant has the burden of proof to demonstrate that there is an exceptional reason about this property that warrants this Variance. In cases where an applicant chooses to have lots on a previously vacant land, the applicant is not meeting the standards.

COMMISSIONER STEINMAN verified with BART ANDERSON, Public Works Department, that the approval of this application would not affect the drainage issue.

MR. BANGAN indicated that if the motion would be for denial, he would prefer holding the item in abeyance for two weeks to further address the issues raised. COMMISSIONER EVANS informed MR. BANGAN that if he was not pleased with the motion, he could appeal the decision or make the project comply with the code.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing closed.

(7:50 – 8:10)

**2-499**

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**SUP-13180 - SPECIAL USE PERMIT - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: VALLEY GROUP HOMES, LLC - OWNER: CRISTINA P. ABU DAYYEH** - Request for a Special Use Permit FOR A PROPOSED GROUP RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY WHICH IS LESS THAN 660 FEET FROM AN EXISTING GROUP RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY located at 1512 Marcus Drive (APN 162-06-212-004), R-1 (Single Family Residence) Zone, Ward 1 (Tarkanian).

**C.C.: 7/12/06 – IF DENIED: P.C.: FINAL ACTION (Unless appealed within 10 days)**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

Planning Commission Mtg.  
City Council Meeting

10

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

Planning Commission Mtg.  
City Council Meeting

0

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Submitted at meeting – Protest petition with 7 signatures by Tom Northouse

**MOTION:**

**EVANS – DENIED – Motion carried with TRUESDELL and GOYNES voting NO and DAVENPORT excused**

**NOTE: A previous motion by GOYNES for approval failed with STEINMAN, TROWBRIDGE, EVANS and DUNNAM voting NO.**

**This is Final Action**

**MINUTES:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing open.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 20 – SUP-13180

**MINUTES – Continued:**

DOUG RANKIN, Planning and Development Department, stated that the Special Use Permit is required as there is another group home within 660 feet of this location. Staff recommended approval as the existing group home has no direct access and is not part of the existing neighborhood on Marcus Drive.

CRISTINA ABU DAYYEH, 1412 Marcus Drive, explained that the residential group home would provide care to the elderly. She has not had any problems at the other three locations. She provides this service for those who cannot afford luxury assisted living. She would not be expanding if there were not a need. She agreed with all conditions.

TOM NORTHOUSE, 1608 Marcus Drive, submitted a petition with seven signatures opposing the proposed care facility because it would depreciate the value of their homes. Additionally, it would create unwanted traffic, including emergency vehicles that might respond at this location.

ARTURO FELIX, 1516 Marcus Drive, appeared in opposition expressing concern about the type of people that would come in this facility.

BRUCE BRENT, 1508 Marcus Drive, stated that Marcus Drive is a cul-de-sac with only ten homes and very little traffic. He moved into this area for its tranquil environment, but he is concerned about what the proposed use would bring. He indicated that the applicant is ready to open the facility without waiting for the approval of this use. COMMISSIONER GOYNES pointed out that the facility would cater to senior citizens. MR. BRENT replied that the residents' safety should be taken into consideration.

IVAN CHIPLINSKY, 1500 Marcus Drive, understood MS. DAYYEH'S commitment to helping people in need, but his concern is the problems the additional traffic would create for the area, especially with the three work shift by staff members. In addition, the existing Alamo business uses Marcus Drive for overflow parking.

MS. DAYYEH was surprised to see the neighbors oppose this use. The purpose of the facility is to serve people in need. She does not foresee any traffic problems because there would only be two to three cars and those would belong to family members visiting. COMMISSIONER STEINMAN discussed with MS. DAYYEH that these facilities are considered assisted living, non-medical care facility. The caregiver will prepare food and take care of their needs. The four-bedroom home will accommodate two people per bedroom. She has owned the home for two years and felt she has taken good care of her home. She indicated that the repair of the roof has been postponed due to an insurance issue. Once that is resolved, she will replace the roof with a tile roof.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 20 – SUP-13180

**MINUTES – Continued:**

COMMISSIONER STEINMAN asked how long the 600-foot radius condition has been in effect. MR. RANKIN replied that that condition was imposed by the State under NRS and has been in existence for six years. The intent of the State law is to avoid a saturation situation in neighborhoods. In this particular application, the two neighborhoods are not adjoined where the other use occurs; therefore, staff felt it would not impact the overall neighborhood by having another use at this location. If the application were approved, the City of Las Vegas will conduct a business license inspection, but the State will be the controller of the actual inspection to ensure that the clients are properly cared for. MS. DAYYEH added that some of the clients have Medic-Aid.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing closed.

(8:10 – 8:30)

**2-1163**

**CONDITIONS:**

Planning and Development

1. Conformance to all Minimum Requirements under LVMC Title 19.04.050 for the Group Residential Care Facility use.
2. This approval shall be void two years from the date of final approval, unless a business license and state approval has been issued for the principal building on the site. An Extension of Time may be filed for consideration by the City of Las Vegas.
3. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied, except as modified herein.

Public Works

4. Meet with the Fire Protection Engineering Section of the Department of Fire Services to discuss fire requirements for the proposed use of this facility.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**SUP-13198 - SPECIAL USE PERMIT - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: LEO GARCIA - OWNER: TEK TJIA** - Request for a Special Use Permit FOR ACCESSORY PACKAGE LIQUOR OFF-SALE WITHIN A PROPOSED GROCERY STORE at 3700 East Charleston Boulevard (APN 140-31-401-036), C-1 (Limited Commercial) Ward 3 (Reese).

**C.C.: 7/12/06 – IF DENIED: P.C.: FINAL ACTION (Unless appealed within 10 days)**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter

**MOTION:**

**STEINMAN – APPROVED subject to conditions – UNANIMOUS with DAVENPORT excused**

**To be heard by the City Council on 7/12/2006**

**MINUTES:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing open.

SETH FLOYD, Planning and Development Department, explained that the proposed request is compatible with the surrounding area and is sufficiently buffered from nearby residential developments. A condition has been added limiting the space to be used for the sale of packaged liquor to 10% of the total floor area. Additionally, conditions have been added regarding a gated and roof enclosure on the site and handicap accessible parking spaces that meet current code requirements. The church located within the subject commercial center will close prior to the opening of the proposed market and the market will take over that space. For all these reasons, staff recommended approval.



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 21 – SUP-13198

**MINUTES – Continued:**

LEO GARCIA, 114 Tamarron Cliffs, agreed with all conditions.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing closed.

(8:30 – 8:32)

**2-1933**

**CONDITIONS:**

Planning and Development

1. Conformance to all Minimum Requirements under LVMC Title 19.04.050 for a Retail Establishment with Accessory Package Liquor use.
2. This approval shall be void one year from the date of final approval, unless a business license has been issued to conduct the activity, if required, or upon approval of a final inspection. An Extension of Time may be filed for consideration by the City of Las Vegas.
3. Handicap accessible spaces must meet all applicable design requirements per the City of Las Vegas standards.
4. A gated and roofed trash enclosure shall be provided on the site in conformance with Title 19 standards.
5. The area designated for the sale of alcoholic beverages shall be limited to 10% of the total floor area of the building.
8. Approval of this Special Use Permit does not constitute approval of a liquor license.
9. The sale of individual containers of any size of beer, wine coolers or screw cap wine is prohibited. All such products shall remain in their original configurations as shipped by the manufacturer. Further, no repackaging of containers into groups smaller than the original shipping container size shall be permitted.
10. This business shall operate in conformance to Chapter 6.50 of the City of Las Vegas Municipal Code.
11. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied, except as modified herein.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**SUP-13209 - SPECIAL USE PERMIT - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER: J & S DIESEL SERVICE, INC.** - Request for a Special Use Permit TO ALLOW A 40-FOOT WIDE PRIVATE STREET FOR A PROPOSED EIGHT-LOT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT on 2.10 acres on the southeast corner of Dorrell Lane and Unicorn Street, APN: 125-24-602-001, R-E (Residence Estates) zone under resolution of intent to R-1 (Single Family Residential), Ward 6 (Ross).

**C.C.: 7/12/06 – IF DENIED: P.C.: FINAL ACTION (Unless appealed within 10 days)**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>1</b>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends DENIAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter

**MOTION:**

**DUNNAM – APPROVED subject to conditions – UNANIMOUS with DAVENPORT excused**

**To be heard by the City Council on 7/12/2006**

**MINUTES:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing open.

DOUG RANKIN, Planning and Development Department, stated that staff is unable to make a recommendation for approval on this project, as an R-1 subdivision is not compatible with a private street concept. In addition, staff's concern is that if a future gate is located on this private street it would have to be placed in such a way that two of the lots would not be part of the private cul-de-sac.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 22 – SUP-13209

**MINUTES – Continued:**

MIKE SZYMANSKI, EMS Engineering, 5160 South Eastern Avenue, appeared on behalf of the applicant and indicated they have always shown a private drive. There is no intention to install a gate. The zoning would have allowed for ten lots by acreage, but he was told to limit it to eight lots to provide larger lots.

RODNEY FRANKLIN, 6359 Washington Avenue, has owned property on the southwest corner of Dorrell Lane and Unicorn Street since 1980. He supports the request because the vacant lot will be developed. The homebuilders association has lost approximately 98 members because they cannot find buildable lots and compete with larger builders.

COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL asked BART ANDERSON, Public Works Department, if the approval of the development as submitted requires a public drive. MR. ANDERSON replied that a public street minimum standard is 47 feet and the applicant is proposing 40 feet. The project could be developed as an R-1 subdivision with a public street. MR. RANKIN added that the minimum lot size of an R-1 is 6,500 square feet. He is not certain if the additional seven feet split three and a half feet on each side would reduce the lots below that square footage. MR. SZYMANSKI replied he was surprised to find out that there was a problem with the private drive and wished he would have been told two years ago when the project first began.

MR. ANDERSON verified with CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE that the 40-foot they are proposing is back of curb to back of curb; therefore, a public street would have an actual narrower back of curb to back of curb of 37 feet and five-foot sidewalks on each side. In addition, a typical public street would require street lights where a private street does not. MR. SZYMANSKI added that a private street is maintained by the homeowners association.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing closed.

(8:32 – 8:39)

**2-2009**

**CONDITIONS:**

Planning and Development

1. Conformance to all Minimum Requirements under LVMC Title 19.04.050 for the Private Streets use.
2. Conformance to the Conditions of Approval for Rezoning (ZON-4215) shall be required.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 22 – SUP-13209

**CONDITIONS – Continued:**

3. This approval shall be void two years from the date of final approval, unless a building permit has been issued for the principal building on the site. An Extension of Time may be filed for consideration by the City of Las Vegas.
4. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied, except as modified herein.

Public Works

5. The private street shall be a common lot that is offered as a public utility easement (P.U.E), City of Las Vegas public sewer easement and public drainage easement to be privately maintained by the Homeowners' Association.
6. A Homeowners' Association shall be established to maintain all private roadways, landscaping and common areas created with this development. All landscaping shall be situated and maintained so as to not create sight visibility obstructions for vehicular traffic at all development access drives and abutting street intersections.
7. The design and layout of all onsite private circulation and access drives shall meet the approval of the Department of Fire Services.
8. Site development to comply with all applicable conditions of approval for Zoning Reclassification ZON-4215 and all other applicable site-related actions.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**SDR-12131 - SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW - PUBLIC HEARING -**  
**APPLICANT/ OWNER: LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT** - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR A PROPOSED TEMPORARY PARKING LOT CONSISTING OF 864 SPACES WITH WAIVERS OF THE PERIMETER AND PARKING LOT LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS on a portion of 77.08 acres at 1001 South Valley View Boulevard (APNs 139-31-702-002 and 139-31-801-006), C-V (Civic) Zone, Ward 1 (Tarkanian).

**C.C.: 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

Planning Commission Mtg.	4
City Council Meeting	

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting	

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends DENIAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Submitted after final agenda and at meeting – Letter of opposition by Kim Gerringer

**MOTION:**

**EVANS – APPROVED** subject to conditions and amending Condition 3 as read for the record as follows:

3. **A Waiver of the perimeter and parking lot landscaping is hereby approved. *In that area to be disturbed by City action, a temporary landscaping plan shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department.***

**To be heard by the City Council on 7/12/2006**

**MINUTES:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing open.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 23 – SDR-12131

**MINUTES – Continued:**

SETH FLOYD, Planning and Development Department, explained that the proposal is inconsistent with Title 19 in that adequate perimeter landscaping is not proposed around the parking area. Staff supports the absence of the interior parking lot trees, as the lot is only temporary and will be replaced at a later date. However, the buffer area will be in place permanently and shade trees should be provided as a visual barrier to the residential properties to the west. Staff recommended denial.

DOWA MEAD, Senior Civil Engineer with the Las Vegas Valley Water District, 1001 South Valley View Boulevard, stated that the purpose for the temporary parking lot is the campus expansion of the Las Vegas Water District, as well as the Las Vegas Springs Preserve. The existing buildings are full and they need to expand on the buildings. Part of that involves the construction of a parking garage, and as a part of that construction, all the parking spaces will be displaced. Additionally, the Las Vegas Springs Preserve visitors center and desert living center are under construction on the north of side of Alta Drive. In preparation for fully staffing those facilities, there is no place for their staff to park. The existing site is a graded dirt lot surrounded by desert rock, no irrigation or landscaping. The applicant is seeking a two to five-year temporary parking lot while the expansion is completed.

MS. MEAD indicated that about six weeks ago the City of Las Vegas Public Works Department approached her and presented her with drawings for four 12x5 reinforced concrete box storm drains and asked the Water District to give the City permission to go across a corner of the Water District's lot. This will tear a third of the proposed buffer landscape requested by staff. She reiterated that the Water District is not requesting for a permanent waiver, but only while the temporary parking lot is in place. They will come back to the Planning Commission and City Council with complete plans.

GEORGE CROMER, 839 Kenny Way, indicated that the temporary parking lot would not only impact the residents on Alta Drive and Valley View Boulevard, but residents that live in the surrounding neighborhoods, such as on Campbell Drive. He was troubled that those residents were not notified, particularly due to the contentious nature of the traffic on Alta Drive. He suggested that the hearing be renoticed so that those people affected by the temporary parking lot would be given an opportunity to be heard. In addition, he asked that a time limit be set for the temporary parking lot.

PENNY NEWMAN, 824 Lacy Lane, submitted a protest letter from her neighbor who resides at 808 Lacy Lane, stating that the Water District has not installed landscaping, fences or anything to protect the residents. The temporary parking will impact flooding.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 23 – SDR-12131

**MINUTES – Continued:**

COMMISSIONER EVANS questioned why the applicant could not provide a berm and some trees along the Valley View Boulevard/Alta Drive area in anticipation of permanent landscaping. MS. MEAD replied there is no current irrigation in that area. They have plans for a master build out. COMMISSIONER EVANS was flabbergasted that the Water District would suggest they not meet the intent of the design standards. MS. MEAD rebutted that they are only asking for a short period of time where the temporary facility be without landscaping. They are not increasing the number of spaces. They are moving and displacing several different parking lots from their current site and moving them to one area. No traffic will enter or exit from Alta Drive. Everybody will continue to come in the same gate off of Fulton Place and Valley View Boulevard. There will be no public or staff access off Alta Drive and this has been strongly enforced by the Water District. She explained that if they install trees along the perimeter they will lose the number of spaces they need.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE also expressed concern about the balance of the property not being adequately landscaped. MS. MEAD responded that the additional setbacks would cause the loss of the parking spaces. The Water District's request is to not landscape the temporary facility for the five-year duration. CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE found this to be inconsistent with the existing beautiful demonstration gardens.

MS. MEAD reiterated the expansion is needed and an architect is working on the overall campus expansion master plan. COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL asked if it were not more appropriate to create the master plan and then come back with the details and timeframe as it relates to the temporary parking. He took a tour of the proposed Springs Preserve and he found it to be the most significant project in the entire Valley. With the amount of money and commitment spent on the Springs Preserve and the project opening in 2007, it would be a real mistake to approve this application.

MARGO WHEELER, Director of Planning and Development Department, clarified that the notices of the public hearing are required by State law and the City exceeds that notice standard by mailing to a 1,000 foot radius. There were 459 notices mailed and 21 of the neighborhood associations within one-mile radius were notified. As this goes forward to City Council, staff would consider possibly expanding that notification radius.

COMMISSIONER EVANS stated that some degree of flexibility can be allowed, but it is critical that the perimeter of that site be adequately landscaped. CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE was willing to make some concession for the area at the corner of Valley View Boulevard and

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 23 – SDR-12131

**MINUTES – Continued:**

Alta Drive it. The area under current design is going to accommodate boxed culverts. Regarding the City of Las Vegas drainage project, MR. ANDERSON explained that those plans are at 30 percent complete and it is not expected to be in a suitable state for two to three years. The construction after that point is not scheduled or imminent. MS. WHEELER recommended adding a sentence to Condition 3 to state that the area to be disturbed by the City action will have a temporary landscaping plan to be approved by the Planning and Development Department.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing closed.

(8:39 – 9:30)

**2-2320/3-1**

**CONDITIONS:**

Planning and Development

1. This approval shall be void two years from the date of final approval, unless a building permit has been issued for the principal construction on the site. An Extension of Time may be filed for consideration by the City of Las Vegas.
2. All development shall be in conformance with the site plan date stamped 03/01/06, except as amended by conditions herein.
3. A Waiver of the perimeter and parking lot landscaping is hereby approved.
4. No turf shall be permitted in the non-recreational common areas, such as medians and amenity zones in this development.
5. All utility boxes exceeding 27 cubic feet shall meet the standards of LVMC Title 19.12.040.
6. Parking lot lighting standards, if utilized, shall be no more than 30 feet in height and shall utilize downward-directed lights with full cut-off luminaries. All lighting shall be directed away from residential properties or screened, and shall not create fugitive light on adjacent properties.
7. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City Departments must be satisfied, except as modified herein.

Public Works

8. Remove all substandard public street improvements, if any, adjacent to this site and replace with new improvements meeting current City Standards concurrent with on-site development activities.



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 23 – SDR-12131

**CONDITIONS – Continued:**

9. Meet with the Flood Control Section of the Department of Public Works for assistance with establishing finished floor elevations and drainage paths for this site prior to submittal of construction plans or the issuance of any building or grading permits, whichever may occur first. Provide and improve all drainage ways as recommended.
10. Site development to comply with all applicable conditions of approval for Z-0026-92 and all other subsequent site-related actions.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**ABEYANCE - MOD-11449 - MAJOR MODIFICATION - PUBLIC HEARING -**  
**APPLICANT/OWNER: GREAT MALL OF LAS VEGAS, LLC** - Request for a Major

Modification of the Town Center Development Plan TO CHANGE THE LAND USE DESIGNATION FROM: GC-TC (GENERAL COMMERCIAL) TO: UC-TC (URBAN CENTER MIXED USE) on 49.82 acres adjacent to the northeast corner of Deer Springs Way and Grand Montecito Parkway (APN 125-20-201-001), T-C (Town Center) Zone [PROPOSED: UC-TC (Urban Center Mixed Use - Town Center) Special Land Use Designation], Ward 6 (Ross).

NOTE: THE APPLICATION HAS BEEN AMENDED TO CHANGE APN 125-20-201-001 TO APN 125-21-201-001 AND TO AMEND TOTAL ACREAGE TO 24.91 ACRES

**C.C.: 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>10</b>

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Submitted after final agenda – Protest letter by Christine West and telephone protest by Dottie Miller for Items 24 – 27
6. Submitted at meeting – Site plans and renderings by James Grindstaff for Items 24 – 27

**MOTION:**

**TRUESDELL** – Motion for Approval failed due to a tie vote, which is tantamount to a **DENIAL** with **EVANS**, **GOYNES** and **DUNNAM** voting **NO** and with **DAVENPORT** excused

**NOTE:** COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL disclosed that at one time he represented the property owner of this subject parcel. That owner has since sold the property to the current developers and because there is no business interest, he voted on the matter.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 24 – MOD-11449

**MOTION – Continued:**

**To be heard by the City Council on 7/12/2006**

**MINUTES:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing open for Item 24 [MOD-11449], Item 25 [VAR-13505], Item 26 [SUP-11444] and Item 27 [SDR-10126].

DOUG RANKIN, Planning and Development Department, recommended approval of the modification from General Commercial Town Center (GC-TC) to Urban Center Mixed Use (UC-TC) since the other portion of the property is located within the Grand Montecito Town Center master planned area. He recommended denial of the open space variance because a revised plan could allow for the additional open space. MR. RANKIN recommended approval of the Special Use Permit to allow 12 stories or taller and the 330-foot residential separation waiver since the larger buildings are located at the back of the site and constitute a minimal impact upon the residents to the south. He explained that this project is a part of both the Montecito Town Center and the Centennial Hills Town Center land use designations, which control land use and development standards.

Regarding the site plan, MR. RANKIN confirmed that staff has thoroughly investigated the standards that apply to each section of the project and the applicant has attempted to fulfill the design criteria as best as possible. The applicant requested waivers of the design standards that staff supported since the project has been shifted back on the site creating less intensity for the residents. MR. RANKIN pointed out there are several conditions required that could significantly impact the site plan and so he acknowledged a condition which addresses the site plan should it suffer those impacts and later require a major amendment and/or require a new site plan review. He recommended approval of the site plan since it is in conformance to the general aspect of both the Town Center and Montecito Town Center guides.

COMMISSIONER DUNNAM noted the many conditions associated with all applications and many that address right-of-way dedications and one condition requiring a new site plan must be submitted. He questioned why there is going to be discussion and possible action of the site plan that is required to be revised and resubmitted.

MARGO WHEELER, Director of Planning and Development, responded that the condition requiring a revised plan is to show compliance of all conditions currently proposed. The applicant has reviewed all conditions, is prepared to address any concerns and MS. WHEELER stated it would be proper to hear this matter as scheduled. At COMMISSIONER EVANS' inquiry, MR. RANKIN clarified that as the conditions are written and according to Title 19.18, the Commissioners could be subjected to reviewing another site plan at a later date. It would depend on the level of review that is required according to how well the applicant would be able to comply with the conditions as currently proposed with the applications. MR. RANKIN stated

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 24 – MOD-11449

**MINUTES – Continued:**

that the review could be heard by the Planning Commission or the City Council depending upon the amount of revisions that occur. CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE commented that because this development has the potential to vastly enhance or degrade the area, it is worthy of the Commissioners to conduct the hearing and voice concerns.

JAMES GRINDSTAFF, 9440 West Sahara Avenue, appeared with SUE GRAY, Perlman Architects. He thanked staff for their assistance with this difficult project as there have been road realignment issues and design reviews. MR. GRINDSTAFF acknowledged that the major concern is how to address ingress and egress within the site: whether to dedicate a right turn lane is best or to continue straight, and whether an acceleration lane should run from the main driveway to the top north of the site. Public Works had commented that because the acceleration lane is on a curvilinear road, it would not be the best use. MR. GRINDSTAFF stated that the City had wanted to share the most northern driveway on Grand Montecito Parkway, and after much consideration, it was decided to be the best option.

MR. GRINDSTAFF noted preference to alter conditions of Item 27 [SDR-10126]. Condition 10 of the site plan prohibits turf at the frontage road of Deer Springs Way and since there will be a bus stop with shelter he requested flexibility to better contain that area rather than put in rocks. He acknowledged that Condition 17 requires approval from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for the proposed height of the project and plans to begin communications with the FAA. Condition 28 confirms the desire to share the driveway off Grand Montecito Parkway. Condition 31 addresses utilities off Dorrell Lane but since Dorrell Lane no longer exists, he would need clarification from Public Works about their preference.

CHRISTINE WEST, 6513 Alpine Forest Court, opposed the project because she stated the changes would adversely affect the tranquility of the community and the value of the homes in the area. The original plan has changed drastically and will now include a high-rise to support the mall. It was confirmed that the high rise would be built on the Montecito portion of the property and will not be built unless they sell out. MS. WEST questioned the likelihood of the high rise not selling out and how that would affect the development and success of the mall. She pointed out that the land was purchased with the knowledge of the zoning restrictions and she urged the City not to allow this development.

TIM and DOTTIE MILLER, 8213 Mountain Heather Court, appeared in opposition. MS. MILLER stated that the residents of her community have endured Modifications, Variances, Special Use Permits, plan amendments and waivers for over nine years. She stated that the vacant land around that area is diminishing and the Town Center concept no longer exists since everything promised has not materialized. This project is not compatible, would set a negative precedent and could change the entire community. MS. MILLER requested that when the item is heard before Council that it be scheduled for a time certain hearing.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 24 – MOD-11449

**MINUTES – Continued:**

MR. MILLER concurred with MS. MILLER'S opposing comments and stated that this project places a hardship on the homeowners. He expressed disappointment that the applicant has not shared the current plan with the Timberlake residents and since there are discussions of proposing yet another plan, he requested the developer host an additional meeting.

JANICE TAYLOR, 8212 Deer Springs Way, stated that she originally supported the mall but since there have been so many changes and inconsistencies from the developer, she now opposes the project. She expressed concern for the impact this development would have on her home, the prices of the proposed condominiums, the density associated with the development and the widening of Oso Blanca Road. MS. TAYLOR requested the City uphold the standards and not consider making allowances for developers so that residents would have stability.

CECILE J. ATKINSON, 8220 Deer Springs Way, stated her desire for Triple Five to abandon the project. The process has been drawn out over two years and now they are proposing a four-story project. She does not support high rises in this location. Residents of this area are ordinary people who cannot afford a \$750,000 home.

ATTORNEY VICKY DRISCOLL, 8336 Antelope Pines, stated that the proposed project would have three times the number of homes currently in Timberlake, without including the mall, which will be open seven days a week. Timberlake is a gated community with only three ways out. The residents will be landlocked and the proposed project poses a safety issue for the residents. She is concerned that everyone going to the mall will find a shortcut through the neighborhoods. The mall was palatable, but the 900 condominium home project is too dense. She asked the Planning Commission to deny the applications.

COMMISSIONER EVANS asked the applicant to discuss the limited access to the freeway, the conditions of approval and the open space issue. MR. GRINDSTAFF replied there are two points of access; Durango Drive and Centennial Parkway/I-215 and Durango Drive and US-95. COUNCILMAN ROSS has conducted several meetings on one specific issue and proposed four different solutions. The residents chose to leave Doe Brook an open street, but to provide some configuration to help protect the neighbors as much as possible. The applicant is willing to make that a private street and pay and maintain for the gate. As far as the bus stop to the east, they will provide a bus stop at their expense to create a safe environment for the kids. A small

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 24 – MOD-11449

**MINUTES – Continued:**

portion of the mall will be three-story and that is the theater and the office portions. The proposed Sears was removed because of the automotive component. A landscaped pedestrian link will be created to connect the neighborhoods to be maintained at the applicant's expense. The parking deck has always been part of the project and it will create a shaded area. The large open space will be located at Oso Blanca Road and Deer Springs Way. Additionally, there will be an enclosed park in the mall with trees and benches.

Regarding the setback issue and distance to the towers, MR. GRINDSTAFF indicated that it meets the 3 to 1 residential setbacks. The hardship issue only applies to the Variance, which is the variance for the open space requirement. If it is denied, they will go back and rework that issue. He indicated that the plan being presented is the exact plan presented at the last meeting that MS. WHEELER and the residents attended.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE discussed with MR. GRINDSTAFF that the overall height will be 250 feet. Currently, they have letters of intent from prospective tenants. They would like to maintain a life style component and high end condominiums with restaurants similar to what exists at Boca Park, such as Cheesecake Factory and Kona Grill.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE commented that the applicant is requesting a waiver of almost an acre of open space requirement, and in lieu of making that into open space, the applicant indicated willingness to pay \$164,000. MR. GRINDSTAFF replied that if the issue is the open space, they will find another anchor of open space or contribute the money if the waiver is not granted. MR. GRINDSTAFF pointed out that people looking to move into these condominiums are looking for a low maintenance lifestyle.

COMMISSIONER EVANS noted that the applicant is asking for height beyond the 12-story is allowable at this location and a waiver of the required open space. He was uncertain how to address the specific issues the applicant had with Conditions 10, 17, 28, 31 and 35 of the site plan. DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY LEWIS pointed out that if the commission is asked to vote on the site plan, they would need to know what the applicant wants the conditions to read.

COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL commented that this project in the middle of Town Center has a very complex plan adopted with the input of the Timberlake Homeowners that required this whole density to be pushed into this area of the community. There is a development agreement with the Montecito Companies that actually requires in their land area to get a floor density of approximately five million square feet. There is no way what they have developed today would

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 24 – MOD-11449

**MINUTES – Continued:**

reach that and there is no way that even with this square footage included would meet what was approved and required of the Montecito Companies. It is important to understand the history of Town Center and how it has evolved. Town Center was a plan to consolidate commercial, retail and medical uses in the Town Center. There is no site development plan on a project of this size that can truly address every question. Hopefully the Timberlake homeowners will feel protected by the fact that changes of significant or substantial nature will have to come before the Planning Commission and City Council.

COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL observed that a one or two-story below ground is significantly less intrusive than a two-story office building. The Montecito Parkway was designed to go through Town Center and is designed to carry a significant amount of traffic. The traffic engineers must ensure the applicant meets all the technical concerns. What is before the Planning Commission is not an aberration to the Town Center Standards and hopefully the developer has met with and will continue to meet with the neighbors as this plan evolves. He will support the waiver of the open space, the site plan, but he was concerned with the height being 18 stories across the board where 12 stories were estimated for Town Center.

COMMISSIONER GOYNES was perplexed about the plan because it began as a mall and now it has a residential component. MR. GRINDSTAFF replied they want to develop the plan with an effective mixed use project. COMMISSIONER GOYNES felt he could not support this project without the residents' support and that a middle ground should be reached. MR. GRINDSTAFF replied that compromises were made. In fact, hundred of residents attended neighborhood meetings, but only a small number of people were present at this meeting.

COMMISSIONER STEINMAN stated that the 250 feet height is excessive and in this neighborhood a hundred would be a fair solution. He questioned the ability to combine the open space. MR. RANKIN explained that as part of the Montecito and Town Center Development Agreement the open space requirement cannot be combined. Montecito requires a 12.5% minimum of open space, with an overall Montecito Development achieving a 20% open space in the future. Town Center is required to have 20% of open space. The deficiency is on the Town Center section of the site where they do not reach the 20% maximum and they cannot be combined for all overall open space. COMMISSIONER STEINMAN felt the applicant met the open space requirement.

COMMISSIONER EVANS asked what can be counted as open space. MR. RANKIN outlined items within Town Center and Montecito such as the landscaped parking lot drive aisles, the landscape buffer width and the pedestrian walkways can be counted as open space; however, in an R-PD if the buffer is on the outside it cannot be counted as open space. COMMISSIONER EVANS was perplexed to see a disagreement with the very concept the developers accepted.



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 24 – MOD-11449

**MINUTES – Continued:**

COMMISSIONER STEINMAN found it interesting that if they took the roof off the mall, everything would comply. In the Valley's climate an enclosed mall is a key issue in retail shopping. He questioned the reason for not determining that the applicant is providing the green space required and not penalize them because they did not meet the 20% on one side of the center line and they over did it on the other side. This property is caught in two separate divisions; Montecito and Town Center. MS. WHEELER explained that the code does not say that the staff is allowed to determine whether or not there is a different interpretation that should be made. The process is to bring it forward to the Planning Commission through the Variance process where the Commission has the discretion to make that decision.

Since the motion resulted in a tie vote, MS. WHEELER explained that only the General Plan Amendments based on NRS requires the super majority; therefore, this item will go forward to the City Council with a tie vote.

Regarding Item 27 [SDR-10126], BART ANDERSON, Public Works Department, suggested and submitted a change to Condition 24 requiring construction of off-site improvements. The only substantive change is that the Grand Montecito Parkway be completed within 12 months of approval of this site by the City Council. Currently, the condition requires that it be constructed concurrent with development. MS. WHEELER recommended that Condition 1 of the same item be amended to add that if SUP-11444 fails, then all height restrictions of the Montecito Development Agreement and the Town Center Design Standards Manual shall be met.

COMMISSIONER STEINMAN indicated that Dorrell Lane referred in Condition 31 no longer exists. MR. ANDERSON acknowledged that there is no Dorrell Lane and that it should be corrected to state the Dorrell Lane alignment. MR. GRINDSTAFF understood the correction and agreed with the amendments to the conditions.

COMMISSIONER STEINMAN asked that since the applicant has been denied the height of the building, if it can be specified that the height may be no higher than a hundred feet. COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL pointed out that the Town Center Standards have a specific height that is significantly higher than that as part of the master approval. MS. WHEELER explained that the language she proposed refers back to the Montecito Development Agreement portion and the Town Center Development Standards Manual. The Montecito does not have a specific height standard; however, the Town Center edge zone is limited to two stories. MR. RANKIN added that if the site plan is approved with the waivers, the limit in Town Center is 12 stories with the modification to the land use. COMMISSIONER STEINMAN asked if it would be proper if a specific height number be included. MR. RANKIN replied that staff prefers stories versus feet because when a development is limited to feet the height and the story can change by six to ten inches. This sometimes could cause some huge problems later on if a project moves forward, especially if it is a residential component with a tentative map.



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 24 – MOD-11449

**MINUTES – Continued:**

COMMISSIONER STEINMAN asked if a hundred feet is about eight stories. MR. RANKIN responded that it could be 101 or 96, depending on the type of material constructed. For this reason, staff prefers stories for height limits. With the denial of the Special Use Permit, 12 stories would be the maximum height on this section. On the Montecito section there is no height limit and they can propose a different project. The two stories depend on the waivers. There is a set of edge zones developments that go back across the property. The applicant has requested waivers of those standards and it depends on whether or not the Commission grants those waivers for those height restrictions. MS. WHEELER further clarified that the deviation over 12 stories part of Item 26 [SUP-11444]. COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL did not have a problem with the 12 stories, but the deviation over 12 stories. MS. WHEELER indicated that the Commission has to consider the waivers within Item 27 [SDR-10126] of the main transition zone, Town Center Core and Town Center Urban Zone Building Height. Since the Special Use Permit was voted down, the request for over the 12 stories was not approved; therefore, 12 stories is the maximum height. COMMISSIONER STEINMAN insisted upon including a specific number of stories and that it be eight stories. COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL made a motion to limit the building on the east end to eight stories and limit the building on the west side to 12 stories with all other amended conditions.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing closed for Item 24 [MOD-11449], Item 25 [VAR-13505], Item 26 [SUP-11444] and Item 27 [SDR-10126].

(9:30 – 10:58)

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**ABEYANCE - VAR-13505 - VARIANCE RELATED TO MOD-11449 - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER: GREAT MALL OF LAS VEGAS, LLC** - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW 15 PERCENT OPEN SPACE WHERE A MINIMUM OF 20 PERCENT OPEN SPACE IS REQUIRED on 49.82 acres adjacent to the northeast corner of Deer Springs Way and Grand Montecito Parkway (APNs 125-20-601-003 and 005; 125-20-602-002, 003, and 005 through 008; and 125-20-603-001 through 004), T-C (Town Center) Zone [GC-TC (General Commercial - Town Center) and MS-TC (Main Street Mixed Use - Town Center) Special Land Use Designation] [PROPOSED: UC-TC (Urban Center Mixed Use - Town Center) Special Land Use Designation], Ward 6 (Ross).

NOTE: THE APPLICATION HAS BEEN AMENDED TO CHANGE APN 125-20-201-001 TO APN 125-21-201-001, AND TO DELETE APNs 125-20-601-003 AND 005, 125-20-602-002, 003 AND 005 THROUGH 008; AND 125-20-603-001 THROUGH 004, AND TO AMEND THE TOTAL ACREAGE TO 24.91 ACRES

**C.C.: 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>9</b>

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends DENIAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Submitted after final agenda – Protest letter by Christine West and telephone protest by Dottie Miller for Items 24 – 27 filed under Item 24
6. Submitted at meeting – Site plans and renderings by James Grindstaff for Items 24 – 27 filed under Item 24

**MOTION:**

**TRUESDELL** – Motion for Approval failed due to a tie vote, which is tantamount to a **DENIAL** with **EVANS**, **GOYNES** and **DUNNAM** voting **NO** and with **DAVENPORT** excused

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 25 – VAR-13505

**MOTION – Continued:**

To be heard by the City Council on 7/12/2006

**MINUTES:**

NOTE: See Item 24 [MOD-11449] for all related discussion.

(9:30 – 10:58)

**3-197**

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**ABEYANCE - SUP-11444 - SPECIAL USE PERMIT RELATED TO MOD-11449 AND VAR-13505 - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER: GREAT MALL OF LAS VEGAS, LLC** - Request for a Special Use Permit TO ALLOW A DEVELOPMENT IN EXCESS OF TWELVE STORIES AND WAIVER FROM THE 330-FOOT DISTANCE SEPARATION REQUIREMENT FROM SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCES on 49.82 acres adjacent to the northeast corner of Deer Springs Way and Grand Montecito Parkway (APN 125-20-201-001, 125-20-601-003, 005; 125-20-603-001 through 004; 125-20-602-002, 003, 005 through 008), T-C (Town Center) Zone [PROPOSED: UC-TC (Urban Center Mixed Use - Town Center) Special Land Use Designation], Ward 6 (Ross).

NOTE: THE APPLICATION HAS BEEN AMENDED TO CHANGE APN 125-20-201-001 TO APN 125-21-201-001; AND ADD APN 125-20-601-006

**C.C.: 7/12/06 – IF DENIED: P.C.: FINAL ACTION (Unless appealed within 10 days)**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

Planning Commission Mtg.  
City Council Meeting

9

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

Planning Commission Mtg.  
City Council Meeting

0

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Submitted after final agenda – Protest letter by Christine West and telephone protest by Dottie Miller for Items 24 – 27 filed under Item 24
6. Submitted at meeting – Site plans and renderings by James Grindstaff for Items 24 – 27 filed under Item 24

**MOTION:**

**TRUEDELL – DENIED – UNANIMOUS with DAVENPORT excused**

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 26 – SUP-11444

**MOTION – Continued:**

To be heard by the City Council on 7/12/2006

**MINUTES:**

NOTE: See Item 24 [MOD-11449] for all related discussion.

(9:30 – 10:58)

**3-197**

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**ABEYANCE - SDR-10126 - SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW RELATED TO MOD-11449, VAR-13505 AND SUP-11444 - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER:**

**GREAT MALL OF LAS VEGAS, LLC** - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR A PROPOSED 1,575,000 GROSS SQUARE-FOOT MIXED-USE REGIONAL MALL WITH 900 RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND WAIVERS OF MAIN TRANSITION ZONE, TOWN CENTER CORE AND TOWN CENTER URBAN ZONE BUILDING HEIGHT, STEPBACK AND BUILD-TO-LINE REQUIREMENTS; AND TO ALLOW 15.4 PERCENT OPEN SPACE WHERE 20 PERCENT IS THE MINIMUM AMOUNT OF OPEN SPACE REQUIRED ON THE TOWN CENTER PORTION OF THE PROJECT on 49.82 acres at the northeast corner of Grand Montecito Parkway and Deer Springs Way (APNs 125-20-201-001, 125-20-601-003, 005; 125-20-603-001 through 004; 125-20-602-002, 003, 005 through 008), T-C (Town Center) Zone [PROPOSED: UC-TC (Urban Center Mixed Use - Town Center) Special Land Use Designation], Ward 6 (Ross).

NOTE: THE APPLICATION HAS BEEN AMENDED FROM A WAIVER OF THE TOWN CENTER URBAN ZONE TO A WAIVER OF THE TOWN CENTER EDGE ZONE BUILDING HEIGHT, STEPBACK AND BUILD-TO-LINE REQUIREMENTS; TO REMOVE THE WAIVER TO ALLOW A REDUCTION IN OPEN SPACE; TO ADD A WAIVER OF TOWN CENTER SETBACK REQUIREMENTS; TO AMEND APN 125-20-201-001 TO APN 125-21-201-001; AND TO ADD APN 125-20-601-006

**C.C.: 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

Planning Commission Mtg.	7
City Council Meeting	

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting	

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Submitted after final agenda – Protest letter by Christine West and telephone protest by Dottie Miller for Items 24 – 27 filed under Item 24

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 27 – SDR-10126

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION – Continued:**

6. Submitted at meeting – Site plans and renderings by James Grindstaff for Items 24 – 27 filed under Item 24 and request of condition change by Public Works

**MOTION:**

**TRUESEL – Motion for Approval failed due to a tie vote, which is tantamount to DENIAL with EVANS, GOYNES and DUNNAM voting NO and with DAVENPORT excused**

**To be heard by the City Council on 7/12/2006**

**MINUTES:**

NOTE: See Item 24 [MOD-11449] for all related discussion.

(9:30 – 10:58)

**3-197**

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**ABEYANCE - VAR-12782 - VARIANCE - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: JAMES E. STROH - OWNER: NORTHBROOKE, LLC, ET AL** - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW 361 PARKING SPACES WHERE 412 IS THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES REQUIRED FOR A PROPOSED CHURCH/HOUSE OF WORSHIP on 7.84 acres adjacent at 4275, 4285, 4295, 4305, 4315, 4325, and 4335 North Rancho Drive (APNs 138-02-712-005, 006, 007, 009, 010, 011 and 012), C-2 (General Commercial) Zone, Ward 6 (Ross).

**C.C.: 7/12/06**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

**5**

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

**0**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends DENIAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Justification Letter
5. Submitted after final agenda – Abeyance request by James E. Stroh

**MOTION:**

**EVANS – Motion to HOLD IN ABEYANCE Item 28 [VAR-12782] to 6/22/2006; Item 13 [MOD-12919], Item 14 [VAR-12925], Item 15 [SDR-12922] to 7/13/2006; and TABLE Item 29 [TXT-13518] – UNANIMOUS**

**MINUTES:**

The applicant of Item 28 [VAR-12782] has requested an abeyance to 6/22/2006 in order to review and address staff's concerns.

(6:06 – 6:07)



**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**TXT-13518 - TEXT AMENDMENT - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER:**  
**CITY OF LAS VEGAS** - Discussion and possible action to amend Title 19.06.060, "Downtown Overlay District;" Title 19.08.040, "Residential District Development Standards;" and Title 19.08.050, "Commercial and Industrial District Development Standards," to address the application of sub-district development standards for the Downtown Overlay District.

**THIS WILL BE SENT TO CITY COUNCIL IN ORDINANCE FORM**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

Planning Commission Mtg.  
City Council Meeting

0

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

Planning Commission Mtg.  
City Council Meeting

0

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends NO RECOMMENDATION

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map – Not Applicable
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

**MOTION:**

**EVANS – Motion to HOLD IN ABEYANCE Item 28 [VAR-12782] to 6/22/2006; Item 13 [MOD-12919], Item 14 [VAR-12925], Item 15 [SDR-12922] to 7/13/2006; and TABLE Item 29 [TXT-13518] – UNANIMOUS**

**MINUTES:**

Staff requested Item 29 [TXT-13518] be tabled until further action by the Council.

(6:06 – 6:07)

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

---

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR:** M. MARGO WHEELER, AICP ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

**TXT-13530 - TEXT AMENDMENT - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER: CITY OF LAS VEGAS** - Discussion and possible action to amend the Lone Mountain Master Development Plan and Design Standards to add "Auto Repair Garage, Minor" to the list of permissible uses, and to define the process for amending the master plan document.

**THIS WILL BE SENT TO CITY COUNCIL IN ORDINANCE FORM**

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

**Planning Commission Mtg.**  
**City Council Meeting**

<b>0</b>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends NO RECOMMENDATION

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location Map – Not Applicable
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

**MOTION:**

**GOYNES – APPROVED – Motion carried with TRUESDELL abstaining because the proposed Text Amendment directly affects his client and DAVENPORT excused**

**To be forwarded to City Council in Ordinance Form**

**MINUTES:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing open.

DOUG RANKIN, Planning and Development Department, explained that the Text Amendment to the Lone Mountain Master Plan will add the land use minor automotive and would allow it by means of a special use permit in Village Commercial, of which Lone Mountain has two sites located both along Cheyenne Avenue and the 215. It would allow mini lubes and minor automotive as defined by Title 19. In addition, it will give it better definition on how the text in Lone Mountain is amended. Staff will be amending the text itself by means of an ordinance as per Title 19, but land use can still be amended by a landowner.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2006  
Planning and Development Department  
Item 30 – TXT-13530

**MINUTES – Continued:**

COMMISSIONER STEINMAN confirmed with MR. RANKIN that the two Village Commercial sites located in Lone Mountain are the Wal-Mart sites.

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE declared the Public Hearing closed.

(10:57 – 11:01)

**4-148**



**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 8, 2006**

**CITIZENS PARTICIPATION:**

ITEMS RAISED UNDER THIS PORTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA CANNOT BE ACTED UPON BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION UNTIL THE NOTICE PROVISIONS OF THE OPEN MEETING LAW HAVE BEEN COMPLIED WITH. THEREFORE, ACTION ON SUCH ITEMS WILL HAVE TO BE CONSIDERED AT A LATER TIME.

**MINUTES:**

CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE mentioned he received a letter from IRWIN MOLASKY in his role as the Chairman of the Downtown Steering Committee congratulating the Planning Commission for its action to deny a Special Use Permit for a proposed liquor license at 7115 Fremont Street. The feeling of the Downtown Steering Committee was that it would have been detrimental to the pedestrian-friendly collection of clubs and other entertainment venues being developed in this particular area. CHAIRMAN TROWBRIDGE thanked MR. MOLASKY for watching what the Planning Commission does and for sharing their goals to make Las Vegas a better place to live.

(11:01 – 11:02)

**4-213**

COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL wished his daughter a Happy Birthday.

(11:02)

**4-254**

**MEETING ADJOURNED AT 11:02 P.M.**

Respectfully submitted:

---

CARMEL VIADO, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

---

ANGELA CROLLI, DEPUTY CITY CLERK